The University of Chicago
Libraries

THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESENCE

By the same Author

THE CALL OF ISRAEL

THE FULNESS OF ISRAEL

THE PEOPLE AND THE PRESENCE

A STUDY OF THE AT-ONE-MENT

BY

W. J. PHYTHIAN-ADAMS
D.S.O., M.C., D.D. (OXON.)
Canon of Carlisle
Chaplain to His Majesty the King

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO
1942

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMEN HOUSE, E.C. 4
London Edinburgh Glasgow New York
Toronto Melbourne Capetown Bombay
Calcutta Madras
HUMPHREY MILFORD
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY

BS619
.G5P5
c.1
Gen

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

Div (Chr. Theol)

1414604

To

MY FRIENDS AND COLLEAGUES

PAST AND PRESENT

of the

CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF THE

HOLY AND UNDIVIDED TRINITY

CARLISLE

PREFACE

MY acknowledgements which are many and various are made for the most part in the text and footnotes; and they will sufficiently indicate to how large an extent I have been dependent upon the labours of others. I have to record, however, a very special debt of gratitude to two of my friends. Canon O. C. Quick very kindly read this book (except for the Epilogue) before it was printed; and his valuable criticisms have been of the greatest help to me in correcting and reinforcing my argument. To the Rev. A. S. Picton I owe the benefit of further useful observations; and he has also borne the burden of reading the proofs, including the even more formidable task of checking the references. Neither of these friends is in any way responsible for the views expressed in the book, but without them its faults would have been even more conspicuous.

W. J. PHYTHIAN-ADAMS

CONTENTS

PREFACE vii

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I

THE OLD COVENANT

I. THE PRESENCE IN EARLY ISRAEL . . 11

II. FAITH AND WORSHIP IN EARLY ISRAEL . 25

III. THE DUALISM OF COVENANT-THEOLOGY . 40

IV. JEREMIAH 59

V. EZEKIEL 77

VI. FAITH AND WORSHIP AFTER THE EXILE . 96

PART II

THE NEW COVENANT

VII. ST. MARK 123

VIII. ST. STEPHEN 145

IX. ST. PAUL 169

Additional Note on St. Paul's Naomorphism . 202

X. ST. JOHN 205

Additional Note on Incarnation and Incorporation 245

EPILOGUE 254

Appendix. The Epistle to the Hebrews . 287

INDEX 293

INTRODUCTION

AMONG all the treasures to be found in the Bible there is one of peculiar worth which has nevertheless been strangely neglected: we may call it the Doctrine of the 'tabernacling' Presence.[1] What this meant for the Old Israel and what it now means, or ought to mean, for Christians will form the subject of this book; but a few words of introduction are needed before we can come to grips with it.

What, to begin with, *is* the Bible? Put in the briefest terms, it can be described as the inspired record of Sacred History, but that answer is insufficient here for two reasons.

The first is that Sacred History did not end with the closing of the Canon of the New Testament; for 'Sacred History' means that special distinguishable current in the flood of world-events in which God reveals Himself at work through His Chosen Servant, Israel. In previous studies on this subject I have dwelt at length upon this point, and need only refer to it briefly here. 'Sacred History', we may say, is the whole history of the Israel of God; that is not merely the history of the Old Israel which is recorded for us in the Old Testament nor, again, simply this with the addition of that part of the New Israel's history which is recorded in the New Testament. Sacred History is the history of Israel in all ages, including those chapters of it which are being written in our own lives.

[1] I use the word 'tabernacle' as an equivalent of the Hebrew *Shaken* (*Mishkan*—the Tabernacle, so later *Shekinah*—the 'tabernacling' Presence) and of the Greek *skēnoō* or *kataskēnoō* when the reference is to the dwelling of God on earth amongst His People.

The Bible is therefore at once less and more than 'the record of Sacred History'. It is less because it stops short at the first century of the Christian era; but it is more because through the Holy Spirit it reveals, as shaped for all time, the course which Sacred History is ordained to follow. This is the second reason why our answer needs to be amplified: we have to ask what is really meant by the word '*Sacred*'. It has in fact a two-fold sense:

(i) We call the history of Israel 'Sacred' because it is the story of a People, called, chosen, consecrated, and set apart by God to be the agent of His Redeeming Purpose. Here again I must be content to summarize conclusions which I have discussed at length elsewhere. In the Old Testament we are given the beginnings of this story: we are shown how the Old Israel, having received the assurance that it had thus been called and chosen, was taught through centuries of disappointment, suffering, and humiliation that its Sacred destiny was not to rule but to serve. Then 'in the fulness of the times' this destiny was consummated in Israel's Messiah; and the New Testament tells us how the Mission of the Perfect Servant of God passed through Him to His Body, the New Israel, the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

This is one aspect of 'Sacred' History, and in it our thoughts are directed principally to Israel itself, the *People* of God. It reveals, in fact, that manward side of the Divine Dispensation which found its fulfilment in the Perfect Manhood of Jesus Christ. Here once for all we learn the true meaning of Divine Election. Those whom God calls He calls indeed to 'Salvation', but not as this term has been so frequently misunder-

stood. In the light of the Gospel 'Salvation' is shown to mean Communion with God in the depths of His Perfect Being; Communion, in other words, with Love. The whole idea of Election is thus transfigured. If a man is to be worthy of this Calling, he must understand 'what manner of Spirit he is of'; he must learn to think with the mind of Christ, not looking to his own things but offering himself for the sake of others. And what is true of the Christian is even more true of the Church of which he has been made a member; for the lesson which the Bible teaches through the history of the Old Israel finds its first and fullest application in the New. 'Sacred' History is thus on the one side the record of the preparation of human nature (in the collective 'person' of the Old Israel) for the Holy Service to which God was calling it: in the New Testament we find the consummation of this process, the consecration of our manhood in Jesus and of the New Israel which was the fruit of His Self-Offering.

(ii) But here already we are touching the other side of the term 'Sacred'. The Bible is much more than the story of a People chosen and taught by God to be His Servant: it tells us how from the first His Presence 'tabernacled' in their midst, till 'in the fulness of the times' it came to dwell not merely *amongst* but *in* them. It is this aspect of the subject with which the following pages are concerned, and it can best be introduced by citing a single quotation made by St. Paul from the Old Testament.

In 2 Cor. vi. 16 St. Paul reminds Christians that 'We are the temple (or, rather, Sanctuary—Gk. *Naos*) of the living God, even as God said,

I will dwell in them,
And walk in them;
And I will be their God,
And they shall be my people.'

The opening words of this quotation can be found in Exod. xxv. 8 and xxix. 45, the remainder come from Lev. xxvi. 12; but they reflect a belief which pervades the whole of the Old Testament. Only there is this difference about the first two lines, that while in the Greek version from which St. Paul is quoting the preposition *En* must be rendered (as in the Hebrew) 'among', or 'in the midst', what St. Paul himself is saying means vastly more than this: he is reminding us that through Christ this '*in the midst*' has become '*within*'. At first glance the change may seem even trivial, and the fact that so little notice has been taken of it suggests that this is more or less the common view of it. Yet as a matter of fact St. Paul is testifying here in the plainest language (and not by any means here only, as we shall see later) to a mystery of the Divine Love which had been at work in Israel since the days of the Exodus. He is proclaiming that just as Israel found in the man Jesus the pattern of that perfect obedient Service for which its history had prepared it, so it found in the Risen and Ascended Christ, the Incarnate Lord, the perfect At-one-ment with God which the whole of its Covenant-worship had foreshadowed.

This is the God-ward side of the Divine Dispensation, and it is this which gives its deepest meaning to 'Sacred History'. But for this, indeed, the Call of the Old Israel would have been a mockery, and its agelong struggles could never have found a final fulfilment.

Human nature by itself, even though it be conscious of the Call of God, even though it behold in Christ the perfect example of the service for which it has been chosen, can neither attain to the standard of life demanded of it nor hope to win through it perfect Communion with Love. But God does not merely call His People, He gives Himself to be with them. Side by side these two, the People and the Presence, move through the pages of Sacred History, till in the God-Man they meet in a mysterious At-one-ment. This is the second 'secret' of the Divine Counsels which the Bible teaches us, and our present object is to trace the stages of its disclosure.

This study falls naturally into two Parts. In Part I, which deals with the Old Covenant, we shall begin by examining the belief in the 'tabernacling' Presence as it existed in and before the days of Solomon. We shall then go on to see how this belief governed the whole course of Israelite worship, while at the same time, with the dawn of loftier conceptions of God, it developed within itself a dualism of thought from which it was never afterwards to escape. 'God's dwelling-place is in heaven, yet His Presence is here on earth in the midst of Israel': this was a problem which for centuries remained insoluble. We shall find how, in spite of this, the belief so far from being abandoned rooted itself ever more deeply in the heart of the Old Israel, so that the Sanctuary of the Presence became, in the words of Ezekiel, 'the pride of their power and the desire of their eyes' (xxiv. 21). Finally, we shall consider the effect upon Israelite religion of the departure of the Presence from Its profaned Temple and of the repeated prophecies of Its Return. In particular we

shall examine the complex system of 'expiation' (atonement)-rites by which post-exilic Judaism sought to maintain or to restore its 'Holiness', so that it might be worthy to meet its God.

In Part II (the New Covenant) we shall study the Doctrine of the Presence as it appears in St. Mark's Gospel and in the teaching of St. Stephen, St. Paul, and St. John. In all of these the old dualism still remains, but it is now seen as an essential stage in the working out of the Eternal Purpose to 'sum up all things in Christ'. (In the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, the dualism has been destroyed: this will be discussed in an Appendix.) In Christ there is a 'New Creation'. A new Body of flesh and blood has come into being through His Death and Resurrection; and this Body which is the first-fruits of a universal At-one-ment is indwelt and knit together by the Spirit of Him who is Eternal At-one-ness, Holy Trinity. Man in Christ is gathered up into the heart of God.

Our study of the At-one-ment cannot, however, stop at this point if it is to be of practical value; for the contrast between what is revealed in Holy Scripture and what actually exists on earth is too painful to be ignored. Inevitably doubts must arise whether the Church has failed in its mission; and it may even be asked how a gospel of Love can be reconciled with any doctrine of Election. In the Epilogue we attempt very briefly to examine this problem. We consider the Church first as the crown and fulfilment of the whole creative process, an inquiry made possible for us by the researches of modern biologists. We find then that, as the New Creation, the Church is a true Organism on a new and higher plane of existence; an

Organism endowed with its own specific Life of Sonhood, the nature and function of which have to be carefully studied. But we realize also, when we measure the growth of this new being against the scale of the spiritual development of humanity, that the nineteen centuries since the Church's birth have been little more than years of adolescence. The Church is still being led towards its maturity in 'the Perfect Man': this seems to be the lesson of history, and it is the lesson also of our times. In every land we see Christians being moved by the Holy Spirit towards the abandonment of their old divisions and the foundation of a real oecumenical fellowship. To-day the wind of At-one-ment breathes ever more strongly: and if we are to redeem this opportunity our immediate task is evident. We must go back to the Holy Scriptures with a new and strong desire and learn from them with awakened minds the riches of the glory of our inheritance.

This short summary may serve to indicate something at least of the interest and importance of our subject. If at first glance it seems that our view of the Holy Scriptures will be a narrow one, when compared for example with that of such a work as Dr. Fosdick's *Guide to Understanding the Bible*, it may be hoped that further examination will lead to a very different conclusion. We shall be concerned, it is true, with the *religion* of Israel, not with the fascinating story of its moral development; but that does not mean that our horizon will be restricted to theological technicalities or to the formalism of rites and ceremonies. These have their own part to play in the making of Sacred History, and it will be our task to consider them at the proper moment; but they are no more than outward signs of

the deepest of all mysteries, the union of matter with Spirit, of the Creation with its God. As we press on along this path immense vistas of thought begin to unroll before us, while new light seems to pour in upon us from every side. And what wonder? For what we are studying is the movement of the Divine Love, whose embrace only the whole universe can satisfy.

PART I

THE OLD COVENANT

Chapter I

THE PRESENCE IN EARLY ISRAEL

WE may begin by examining a fragment (1 Kings viii. 12–13) which is of extraordinary interest because it probably preserves the words actually used by Solomon at the dedication of his Temple. This passage, which is defective in the Hebrew but can be restored without difficulty from the Greek,[1] may be translated as follows:

'Then said Solomon,
The Sun hath Jahweh set in the heavens;
He (himself) hath resolved (promised) to "tabernacle"
in thick darkness:
Built have I a lofty mansion for thee,
A place for thee to dwell in for (all) ages.'

An appended note in the Greek states that these words were written in 'The Book of the Song', which is evidently a mistake, by the transference of two Hebrew letters, for 'The Book of Jashar'. This ancient collection of poems contained, as we know, Joshua's adjuration of the sun and moon during the battle of Beth-horon (Joshua x. 12–13) and David's Lament for Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i. 17–27): it is therefore not surprising that it should have included the lines spoken by Solomon on this great occasion.

But what do these words imply? When we study them more closely we find that they provide us with remarkable and important information about the religious

[1] Skinner, *I and II Kings* (Century Bible), p. 143; Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, pp. 110–11.

faith and practice of Israel in the first centuries after the Settlement in Canaan. Let us see then what they have to tell us:

(1) We note first the reference to 'thick darkness' (Hebr. *araphel*). This is a clear echo of the description of the original Theophany on the summit of Horeb, where it is said (Exod. xx. 21) that, while the people in terror stood afar off from the smoking mountain and its thunderings and lightnings and trumpet-blasts, Moses 'drew near unto the thick darkness (*araphel*) where God was'.

We are carried back, in other words, to that great day in the distant past which witnessed the inaugural consecration of Israel as the People of Jahweh. Students of the Old Testament who have learned to trust the ancient Tradition at least in its 'bare essentials'[1] will feel no surprise at finding it thus corroborated by Solomon; but this corroboration has a significance of its own which demands special notice here. We are reminded in these words not merely of the Theophany itself (the meeting of Jahweh with Moses in the thick darkness) but of all that immediately preceded and followed it; of the journey to Horeb with the guidance of the Pillar of Cloud and Fire; of the solemn ratification of the Covenant by the blood of sprinkling; and, not least, of the construction of the Sacred Ark which led the hosts of Israel from that day onwards.

(2) We can understand now the full meaning of the word 'tabernacling' as applied to Jahweh's Presence amongst His People. Dr. Temple, in commenting on John i. 14 (the Word . . . 'tabernacled'), says that this expression suggests 'a brief sojourn', though 'all thought

[1] Phythian-Adams, *The Fulness of Israel*, p. 36.

of a momentary apparition is excluded'.[1] But this is not at all the significance of the word either in the Old Testament or (as will be seen later) in the Fourth Gospel where it is deliberately echoed. The 'tabernacling' of Jahweh in the midst of Israel did not in the least imply that He was to be 'there to-day and gone to-morrow': it emphasized the fact that He was never to be thought of as 'pinned down' to one particular locality, even though His Ark might be 'resting' in one particular Sanctuary.

Jahweh was one who '*walked*' among, and before, and with, His People: this was a truth which Israel was never for a moment allowed to forget. Their God was not like one of the idols of the heathen, to be carried about as a burden, and set down in one fixed place at the whim of its worshippers:

Bel boweth down,
Nebo stoopeth;
Their idols are upon the beasts, and upon the cattle:
The things that ye carried about are made a load,
A burden to the weary beast.
They stoop, they bow down together;
They could not deliver the burden,
But themselves are gone into captivity.

Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob,
And all the remnant of the house of Israel,
Which have been borne by me from the belly,
Which have been carried from the womb:
And even to old age I am he,
And even to hoar hairs will I carry you:
I have made and I will bear;
Yea, I will carry, and will deliver. (Isa. xlvi. 1–4.)

[1] W. Temple, *Readings in St. John's Gospel*, pp. 13–14.

So it had ever been:

'For he said,
Surely they are my people,
Children that will not do falsely:
So he was their saviour
from all their affliction.
No messenger nor angel
But his own Presence delivered them;
In his love and in his pity
he redeemed them,
And lifted them up and carried them
all the days of old.' (Isa. lxiii. 8–9 Gk.)

This was a belief which distinguished the religion or Israel for all time from that of the surrounding nations, and it survived in spite of the fact that the Presence of Jahweh was represented in outward form by a chest of cedar-wood which must be carried on the shoulders of its worshippers. How are we to explain this apparent paradox? In part it was no doubt due to the phenomenon of the Pillar of Cloud and Fire, which led the people to the Mount of God before ever the Covenant was ratified or the Ark was made. In later days the Cloud was thought of as the vehicle of the Divine Presence at first in the place of, and subsequently side by side with, the Ark.[1] This was a less earth-bound conception than the other and helped greatly to emphasize the majestic freedom of Jahweh's movements: it could be pictured as the mighty eagle-pinions on which He bore Israel from Egypt to Himself (Exod. xix. 4; Deut. xxxii. 11–12).

Yet the difficulty of the Ark itself remained, and it was the Ark which, except for the single interval of its

[1] Phythian-Adams, *The Call of Israel*, pp. 91–5, 133–4.

eclipse, was always for pre-exilic Israel the sign *par excellence* of the 'tabernacling' Presence. Here therefore a special symbolism was needed, and here the 'tabernacle' idea itself provided the answer. In the important passage 2 Sam. vii. 1–17, to which we shall have occasion to return later, this idea finds most striking and vivid expression. We read there that David informed Nathan of his intention to build a house of cedar, like his own palace, for the Ark of Jahweh. Nathan at the moment applauded this decision, but the same night was given the following message for the king:

> 'Thus saith Jahweh, shalt thou build me an house to dwell in? For I have not dwelt in an house since the day that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even to this day, but have *walked* in a tent and in a *tabernacle*. In all places wherein I have *walked* with all the children of Israel, spake I a word with any of the [judges] of Israel, whom I commanded to feed my people Israel, saying, Why have ye not built me an house of cedar?'

The meaning of this is self-evident. Jahweh has never hitherto dwelt (*lit.* sat down) in a fixed abode in the midst of Israel. His Sanctuary has always been a movable Tent, and this very fact has expressed His unalterable Will: He is the God who walks to and fro amongst and with His People. It has been urged that this statement of the situation is unhistorical, because in the description of the Sanctuary at Shiloh (1 Sam. i. 9, &c.) there is a suggestion of a permanent building. But this argument, never a very cogent one, loses its force entirely when it is faced with another fact. When the Ark was installed in the 'oracle' (the Holy of Holies) of Solomon's Temple we are told that its

staves were so long that the ends of them could be seen from the holy place, i.e. in the first chamber of the Sanctuary or *Hekal* (1 Kings viii. 8). Why was this detail thought worthy of insertion? The answer is given in Exod. xxv. 15 (the Priestly Code, but not necessarily for that reason a late tradition), where we are told that the staves, i.e. the carrying-poles, of the Ark must be left always in their rings: '*they shall not be taken from it*'.

This is simply the 'tabernacling' idea expressed in another form, and it shows that, even while he contravened the orders given to his father, Solomon did not dare to infringe the primary significance of the Ark. It might 'rest' in a house of cedar as the earthly throne of Jahweh, but it must never cease to be what it had always been, the *mobile* vehicle of His Presence ready at any moment to resume its activity. No king of Israel, however good his intentions, might impose upon its God a fixed dwelling-place of his own choice and building. If the Presence 'tabernacled' in the Sanctuary of the Temple, this was simply because it was Jahweh's pleasure to place His Name there; and what He had placed, He could remove.

We cannot for the moment follow this thought farther, but it may be useful to re-emphasize its meaning. There is no question here of 'a brief sojourn' of the Presence in the midst of Israel. On the contrary, from the moment of the People's consecration by Covenant (and indeed earlier, but this is not important for our purpose) Jahweh vouchsafed to them His Presence in their midst, as their leader in battle, their oracle for counsel, and the true earthly focus of their worship; *and this Dispensation was intended to last for all time.*

The Covenant-People and the Covenant-Presence are inseparable in the religious thought of Israel: where one is, there the other must be, not temporarily but for ever.

(3) With this belief in our minds we can pass on to consider the implications of the first two lines of Solomon's dedication-formula:

> The Sun hath Jahweh set in the heavens;
> He (himself) hath resolved (promised) to 'tabernacle' in thick darkness.

That a paradox is deliberately intended here is obvious, and sheds a remarkable light upon the religious ideas of Israel at this early period. To quote Dr. Skinner:

> 'The higher religious minds of Israel had therefore advanced beyond the conception of a merely tribal or national Deity to that of a God who, under self-imposed limitations, is the Maker and Lord of Nature. . . . The theology of the passage may be expressed in these three propositions: (1) the temple is literally the dwelling-place of Yahweh; (2) Yahweh is at the same time the Creator of the world; (3) the darkness in which He dwells symbolizes the mystery of Divinity, the contrast between His nearness to Israel and His essential power and majesty.'[1]

We have seen that the third of these propositions must be amplified to include the thought of the Covenant.

The darkness is that of the Divine Cloud (the Pillar of Cloud and Fire) from Horeb, which after the capture of the Ark came to be thought of as the Focus of the Presence.[2] This, however, is a comparatively minor point, and it is to the two former propositions that we have to turn our attention.

No comment is needed on the first of these, though its full significance must be discussed later: the second,

[1] Skinner, op. cit., pp. 143–4.

[2] See below, p. 47 f.

however, is rather more disputable, and we must dwell upon it a little longer. Is it, in fact, quite true to say that Jahweh is regarded here no longer as 'a merely tribal or national Deity' but as 'the Maker and Lord of Nature', and the 'Creator of the World'? If we are to understand by this statement that we are dealing here with a reasoned theology, this is scarcely admissible; such a view of the world seems to have found its first conscious expression in the prophecies of Amos. It would appear rather that the theology represented in these words is one which goes back far beyond the days of Solomon and which can be seen at its best in the heretic Pharaoh's famous hymns to Aton.[1] In these we have the same combination of ideas, the thought of the national and imperial god of Egypt who is yet the creator of all things, from sun to earth, from man to chicklet; who gives day and night and the revolving seasons; who provides the Nile for his own people in Egypt and a heavenly Nile for his Syrian subjects; but whose relations with the world outside the domains of the Pharaoh are never defined, since there is never any occasion to mention them. This concentration upon the needs and blessings of one's own country or nation is, of course, wholly illogical, when the god whose favour is being applauded is spoken of in the same breath as the creator of the world. And yet it is also perfectly natural at a certain stage of thought, because man is content to deal with the things immediately under his nose and does not tire his brain with wider and less practical speculations.

It may be assumed that the same kind of lofty but imperfectly reasoned faith characterized Israel from

[1] Breasted, *History of Egypt* (1920), pp. 371–6.

the Exodus onwards. To the question, Who is Jahweh? they would have had two answers. First, He is the Covenant-God of Israel, dwelling in our midst and ruling us by the Law which He gave to Moses. Second, He is the God whose power and majesty we have seen continually at work for our protection or deliverance. Through His many signs and wonders displayed on our behalf we *know* that He commands all the forces both of heaven and of earth. Lightnings and thunders and hail and earthquakes, light and darkness, the waves of the sea, the flow of rivers; all these we have seen obeying Him. And how could this be, if He had not Himself created them and ordained their movements? Who but a fool could think otherwise?

In the early stages of Israelite history thought would not need to travel farther than this: it was only at a much later date, when the worship of the 'hosts of heaven' began to exercise an insidious attraction, that deeper reflection became necessary. Even then, as we can see from Deut. iv. 15–24, it took at first an extraordinarily naïve form. Jahweh, who has brought Israel out of Egypt by His Presence (iv. 37), and made Himself known to them out of the formless majesty of fire, has expressly forbidden them to 'lift their eyes to heaven', lest they be drawn away to worship the sun and the moon and the stars 'which Jahweh thy God hath divided unto all the peoples' (for their worship). If we can find a 'theology' of this description in so late a document,[1] we can scarcely

[1] The passage seems to belong to the second 'Stage' of Deuteronomy which must be dated before the fall of the Northern Kingdom (and presumably also before the prophecies of Amos which mark a great advance upon it). See the present writer's 'Origin and Evolution of Deuteronomy', *Church Quarterly Review*, 1937, pp. 215–47.

assume a more profound interpretation of the universe in the words of Solomon.

This, however, having been said, it remains true that the paradox contained in them is sufficiently startling to deserve very careful study. We have seen that, as they stand, their meaning is quite clear: Jahweh who made heaven and earth nevertheless condescends to 'tabernacle' Himself among His People. But what is the significance of this? The significance lies in the fact, which has been almost universally overlooked, that what Jahweh is described as doing *now*, He has been doing ever since He led Israel from Horeb to the Promised Land.

It is a most remarkable fact that this perfectly obvious inference has been so widely ignored by scholars, who usually ask us to believe that while Israel was fighting its way to the possession of the Land of Canaan, Jahweh its Covenant-God was conceived as still dwelling on His distant mountain-top in Midian! Naturally this view is based on evidence (which will be considered in a moment); but what we have to realize is that no amount of *apparent* evidence to the contrary can be allowed to stand against the central feature of the Covenant-religion of Israel. That religion was focused upon the Sacred Ark as the representative of Jahweh's Presence, not merely accompanying but *leading* His People to their heritage. This is the basic Tradition, and it is far too strong to be ignored. In whatever sense Horeb was regarded as a dwelling-place of Jahweh, it ceased to be so for all time when the march to Canaan began. Then Jahweh put Himself at the head of His People, and from that day onwards His Presence never

ceased to 'tabernacle' amongst them and to 'walk with them'.[1]

If any further evidence of this is needed, it can be found in the fact that the Land itself was Jahweh's before it was Israel's. This is the significance of the 'devotion' of Jericho, the first city to be captured: it was claimed by Jahweh as His first-fruits, just as He claimed the first-fruits of the herds and crops bred and grown upon His soil. So David later protested at being driven out of the country that he might not 'share in Jahweh's inheritance' (1 Sam. xxvi. 19). So, too, Naaman carted away 'two mules' burden of earth', that is, of Jahweh's earth, in order that he might be able to offer sacrifices to Jahweh on it, even in a land whose earth belonged to another god (2 Kings v. 17). This intimate connexion between the soil of the land and the God who has conquered it is quite unintelligible, unless He is thought of as actually present within its borders; and we shall see in due course that from the first days of the Settlement there was always a Sanctuary of the Presence which was the true focus of all Israelite worship.

What are we to make, then, of the opening lines of Deborah's Song which appear to presuppose an entirely different view? It is to be noted first that they are part of the opening stanza or prelude, which consists of an apostrophe of Jahweh quite separate from the actual account of the battle. We may study them in Dr. Burney's rendering:

[1] Elijah's visit to Horeb does not disprove this, for the writer hints that he should not have sought the Presence there. Hence, though he was vouchsafed a message, it was one which began with a rebuke: 'What doest thou *here*, Elijah?'

Bless ye, Jahweh!
Attend, ye kings; give ear, ye rulers!
I—to Jahweh I will sing,
Will make melody to Jahweh, the God of Israel.
Jahweh, in thy progress from Se'ir,
In thy march from the field of Edom,
Earth quaked, yea heaven rocked,
Yea, the clouds dropped water.
The mountains shook before Jahweh,
Before Jahweh, the God of Israel.

(Judges v. 3–5.)

After this follows the description of Canaan before Deborah's rise; then the call to battle, the eulogy of the tribes which rallied to Barak, and the rebuke of those who held back; and finally, from verse 19, the story of the battle itself, when the stars fought against Sisera and the Kishon swept his army away. It is to be observed that there is no mention *here* of 'the earth quaking' or of the 'mountains shaking' before Jahweh.

The conclusion seems obvious. Deborah is not speaking in her prelude of what Jahweh did in the defeat of Sisera: she is celebrating the majesty of the Covenant-God of Israel by recalling His march at the head of His People from Horeb. This is, in fact, the only explanation open to us; and if it is objected that she makes no mention of the Ark, the answer is that she *does* indirectly do so. As evidence of this we may cite Ps. lxviii, which opens with a similar paean of praise to Jahweh, and then goes on with an explicit reference to the march from Horeb:

O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people,
When thou didst march through the wilderness;
The earth trembled,
The heavens also dropped at the Presence of God.

The reference to the Ark is here unmistakable, for the Psalm begins with the words 'Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered', which (as we know from Num. x. 35) was the formula used 'when the Ark set forward'.

We cannot, of course, infer from this that Deborah brought the Ark down from Mount Ephraim to Barak's assistance, though this may be the meaning of her words, 'Is not Jahweh gone out before thee?' (Judges iv. 14). But the fact that it is not actually mentioned does not in the least mean that she did not do so; for the Ark was at that period so closely identified with Jahweh Himself that there would be no need to name it. The silence of the documents, indeed, so far from being a formidable objection, in reality proves nothing one way or the other; and this must always be so when as here the very familiarity of a thing allows it to be taken for granted. So, for example, when we read in the Covenant Code that every Israelite must 'appear before Jahweh' at certain times in the year, we are expected to know that this implies his making a special pilgrimage to the Sanctuary of the 'tabernacling' Presence. Exactly in the same way, when we are told of 'Jahweh's' walking with His People (as in 2 Sam. vii. 6–7) it is tacitly assumed that this refers to the movements of the Sacred Ark.

The fact that the Ark *is* mentioned in the tragic narrative of 1 Sam. iv ff. is of particular interest in this connexion, for it provides the 'exception which proves the rule'. It is mentioned precisely because its capture by the Philistines showed all too clearly that it had ceased to be the vehicle of the Presence. Hence, even after it had been brought back to honour by David and had been carried by him to fresh victories on the

battle-field, it never quite recovered the place of primacy which it had once possessed. To dissociate it entirely from the Presence would naturally have been unthinkable before the Exile, and when Solomon installed it in the Holy of Holies he no doubt regarded it as the immemorial seat of the God of Israel. But meanwhile new *theologumena*[1] of the Covenant had made, or were making, their appearance, and the Ark was constrained to share its glory with them.

At this point, however, we are touching upon the subject of the pre-exilic worship of Israel, and this will require a separate chapter.

[1] The material objects (the Ark, Tables of Stone, &c.) or concepts (the Cloud, the Glory, &c.) associated with the 'tabernacling' of the Presence may be conveniently termed the *theologumena* of the Covenant. See Kautzsch, 'The Religion of Israel', *H.D.B.*, vol. v.

Chapter II

FAITH AND WORSHIP IN EARLY ISRAEL

WE have now to ask ourselves two questions: What in this early period was the chief characteristic of Israelite worship, and how was this worship as a whole related by faith to the 'tabernacling' Presence?

The first of these questions presents no great difficulty, for it is universally agreed that the dominant note of early Israelite worship was *eucharistic*.[1] This is evident, at the outset, from the fact that one of the earliest generic names for sacrifice was *minhah*, a 'gift', and that the commonest *form* of sacrifice was that of the *shelamim* (E.V. 'peace-offerings'), which seem to have combined the idea of a recompense made in gratitude to Jahweh and of a 'sacrifice for friendship' which was shared by Him with His worshipper. Certainly at this date there is no mention of special 'expiatory' or propitiatory rites such as those of the later 'sin-offerings' (*Chattath*) and guilt-offerings (*'Asham*); though on those (fortunately rare) occasions when Jahweh showed His displeasure, a whole 'burnt-offering' or holocaust (*'Olah*) would be the natural way of expressing repentance. David's sacrifice on the threshing-floor of Araunah (2 Sam. xxiv. 18–25) is an example of this kind, and it is to be noted that the king was moved to offer it not as a ritual formality by which God might be placated but as a 'sacrifice' which would express his own deep personal penitence: 'neither will

[1] The subject is fully dealt with by Buchanan Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, 1925, and W. O. E. Oesterley, *Sacrifice in Ancient Israel*, 1937. See also Moore, 'Sacrifice' (*Enc. Bibl.*).

I offer burnt-offerings unto Jahweh my God which cost me nothing.'

That the prevailing note of early Israelite worship was eucharistic will not surprise us after our study of the facts reviewed in the preceding chapter; provided that we realize that the stories of constant rebellion recorded in the Book of Judges are interpretations inserted, mistakenly but in good faith, by the later Deuteronomic editors of that book. If we want a true picture of those times we must look for it in such contemporary documents as the Song of Deborah and the earlier strata of the Books of Samuel. There indeed we find a People by no means free from ordinary human failings: we hear of tribesmen faint-hearted in the cause of Jahweh or selfishly indifferent to the fate of their brethren; of warriors in the flush of victory forgetful of the Covenant Ban upon the blood; of wizardry and necromancy; of drunkenness even at the Sanctuary of the Presence, and of misconduct even on the part of its ancient Priesthood. But this is only one side of the picture; on the other side we find an ardent loyalty to Jahweh, a loyalty which not even the loss of His Ark can shatter: we find, in short, a People conscious of its sacred past and fighting heroically for a heritage which is equally sacred.

'*Jahweh's People for Jahweh in Jahweh's land*', this formula may be taken to sum up the outlook of early Israel; and just as in war-time a victory would naturally be celebrated with a sacrifice of thanksgiving to Jahweh as the God of Hosts, so in times of peace a regular series of such sacrifices would mark the nation's gratitude to Him as the Lord of the Land and the Bestower of its fruits upon His People. This latter

thought is brought out very clearly in Deut. xxvi. The Israelite is bidden to carry his first-fruits in a basket to Jahweh's Sanctuary and, after having offered them there, to recite a brief summary of Jahweh's goodness to Israel in the past. After describing His deliverance of the People from Egypt and His gift to them of 'this land, a land flowing with milk and honey', the worshipper is to end: 'And now, behold, I have brought the first of the fruit of the ground, which thou, Jahweh, hast given me', and he is then to set down the basket before Jahweh his God, and to worship before Him, and to rejoice in all the good which Jahweh his God has given unto him and to his household.

This interesting fragment of ritual though it shows signs of having been edited by later writers may well be ancient, and it illustrates admirably the spirit of worship which must have prevailed in early Israel. It reflects the faith of an age which is relatively simple and unsophisticated, when a man 'appeared before' his God without any sense of the gulf which separates the creature from its Creator. This is just the atmosphere which we find in the account of Elkanah's yearly pilgrimage to Shiloh (1 Sam. i. 3—ii. 20). Once a year, as a matter of course, he 'appears before Jahweh' there with his wives and family, and offers his appointed sacrifice, a 'peace-offering' in which they all share: this is an opportunity too for making a special petition before the Presence and of vowing a special vow if it should be granted. The whole story gives an impression of simple and natural homeliness which is most attractive; and we have no reason to doubt that it is perfectly authentic. Provided a man lived as the Code told him to live, he had nothing to fear from

Jahweh but rather everything to thank Him for; and Jahweh drawing near to accept the offering of His son would smile upon his feasting and bless him in home and in field.

Here our second question arises: How was the worship of early Israel related *as a whole* to the 'tabernacling' Presence? This question has to be answered because it is quite clear that there was as yet no knowledge of any law restricting sacrifices to a single Jahweh-altar, a practice which is enforced in the Book of Deuteronomy. The Covenant-Code (Exod. xx. 24) makes this plain, for it provides for the building of a special Jahweh-altar in 'every place' where He shall 'cause His Name to be remembered'. The meaning of this last phrase is ambiguous. It might be taken to refer only to those places where a special appearance of Jahweh or a signal victory was commemorated: Shechem, Bethel, and Beersheba would then be among the former class, and Saul's victory in Aijalon in the latter (1 Sam. xiv. 31–5). But this is probably too narrow a view, since we hear of Samuel's building an altar at Ramah which was simply his own home-town (1 Sam. vii. 17, cf. i. 19). In a case of this kind we may suppose that what made the altar legitimate was not the events which had happened at the place where it was built but the nature of the personage who consecrated it; and this suggests that the 'commemoration' of Jahweh's Name could be made ritually by those whom He Himself appointed, e.g. the Judges, the King, the Aaronic priests, and possibly also the Levites.

However this may be, it is an unquestioned fact that Jahweh-altars did exist, up and down the country, in 'high-places' specially consecrated to Covenant-

worship. Here were held village festivals such as that of Samuel at Ramah (1 Sam. ix) and family feasts such as that of David at Bethlehem (1 Sam. xx. 6, 28–9); and here, as at the Sanctuary of the Presence, vows could be made even from a distance and subsequently implemented by sacrifice (2 Sam. xv. 7–8). Indeed, such an arrangement was not only natural but necessary. The Code commanded the appearance of every Israelite only three times in the year 'before Jahweh', i.e. at the Sanctuary of the Presence, but even these rare attendances must have been difficult for the majority. The Feast of Unleavened Bread (*Mazzoth*), for example, which was one of the three, followed immediately on Passover, which according to the earliest usage must be kept in a man's own home: it would thus be physically impossible to perform the pilgrimage, unless the Sanctuary was quite close at hand. It may be presumed, in fact, that most Israelites followed the example of Elkanah, and interpreted the Law as commanding attendance on one out of the three stated occasions; which would virtually mean the last of them, i.e. The Feast of Ingathering ('Booths') at the year's end. This feast came actually to be known as *The* Feast (*par excellence*), which strongly supports this conjecture.

It is clear, in short, that not merely in theory but still more in practice local Jahweh-altars were an indispensable necessity. The very fact that one of the common words for sacrifice, *zebah*, means literally 'that which is slain' reminds us that according to the Law no animal might be slaughtered for food, unless the blood was ritually offered to Jahweh. No high festivity therefore was possible (for in the Near East there

can be none without a plenteous supply of meat) unless the proper provision had been made for consecrating the meal as a 'peace-offering' (1 Sam. xiv. 32–5). This alone shows that Jahweh-altars must have been very numerous and makes it impossible to suppose that they were restricted to a few places of outstanding sanctity. (It may be noted in passing that the Code of Deuteronomy which forbids sacrifice of any kind except at the altar in Jerusalem is forced to make provision for the slaughtering of animals for food 'within the gates', i.e. in a man's own village (Deut. xii. 15–16); but it is clear from the story of Saul's emergency altar on the battle-field that this was an innovation and not the ancient rule.)

How then did the Israelite think of Jahweh when he was offering his sacrifice at a high-place? The word *'olah* ('whole burnt-offering') means literally the 'Ascender', 'that which goes up', and suggests the idea of the Deity sitting in heaven and smelling with satisfaction the 'sweet savour' which reaches Him there. Since these words are actually used of Jahweh in Gen. viii. 21 when Noah offered his sacrifice after the Flood it is very easy to think of the early Israelite as sharing this view. We have seen that he actually did nothing of the kind, but this impression has gained so firm a root that it may be well to consider the facts at greater length.

Our main difficulty in forming a true picture of early Israelite religion lies in the extremely scanty evidence which is available to us in the Books of Joshua and Judges. Thus although we know that the vitally important district around Shechem must have been captured at a very early date by the tribe of Ephraim,

which was then the leader of the Nation, not a single detail of this event has been preserved for us. Worse still, from the point of view of our present subject, we hear nothing of what must have been for many years the great central Sanctuary of the Presence of Jahweh, 'the Gilgal', opposite the rift between Ebal and Gerizim (Deut. xi. 29–30, xxvii. 1–13).[1] These omissions are not surprising, because the history of those days has passed through the hands of successive editors from the Kingdom of Judah, who abhorred everything connected with the heathen Samaritans as fervently as they extolled the glory of their own Temple at Jerusalem. This artificial silence is nevertheless a great calamity for the modern reader, for it means that his knowledge of the Sanctuary and what took place there is confined to the first few opening chapters of 1 Samuel and the tragic story of Nob (1 Sam. xxi–xxii).

One of the obvious results of this is that little or no attention is paid to this subject. It is assumed almost without question that this Sanctuary which, when we first hear of it, was hidden away in an obscure corner of Mount Ephraim, was something of very secondary importance in the religious life of Israel; and Eli and his two misbehaving sons are thought of as almost its

[1] *The Fulness of Israel*, pp. 130–3. I have argued there that 'the Gilgals' of Palestine must have been circular enclosures built to shelter the Ark, and this seems to be confirmed by the otherwise unintelligible statement of Ezekiel (x. 13) that the wheels of the chariot of the Presence were 'called in his hearing Gelgel'. If a Gilgal was surrounded, or had within it a circle of twelve stones (Joshua iv. 20), it would be aptly termed 'a wheel in the midst of a wheel' (Ezek. i. 16). The Gilgal at Shechem was 80 ft. in diameter (not 80 yds. as I wrote by a slip of the pen in *F.I.*, p. 132): I found no signs on the site of the 'huge blocks' reported by Adam Smith in 1901, but the 'broad winding road' to the summit is clearly visible. (G. A. Smith, *Deuteronomy*, p. 154.)

sole ministrants, while the eighty-five priests of Nob are completely forgotten! We have to exert our imaginations to realize that only a fraction of the whole story has been told us, and that the least glorious. Behind the tragedy of Nob and the still greater disaster of Shiloh lie the centuries of the untroubled predominance of Ephraim when the memories of Horeb were still recent, and the Philistine power had not yet menaced the freedom of Israel; then, if we could recapture the vision, we should understand what it meant to an Israelite that Jahweh God of Hosts 'tabernacled' amongst His People.

This is not to say, however, that we are left entirely to conjecture. There is first the evidence of the two passages of Deuteronomy already cited. The shorter of these (Deut. xi. 29–30) commands Israel, when it has been brought by Jahweh into the land which He is giving it, to 'set the blessing upon Mount Gerizim and the curse upon Mt. Ebal' which are opposite 'the Gilgal'. This is amplified in Deut. xxvii, where the people are bidden 'on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan', to set up great stones with plaistered faces on which all the words of the law are to be inscribed. These stones are to be set up 'in Mount Ebal', where a Jahweh-altar is to be built and a feast of rejoicing celebrated. Moses then proceeds to name the tribes which are to 'stand upon Mt. Gerizim' to bless, and 'upon Mt. Ebal' to curse, the people; and the chapter ends with a list of the curses (but not of the blessings) which are to be pronounced.

The very great significance of these fragments (for in their confused and mutilated condition they are nothing more) deserves careful study. That they refer

to rites and ceremonies which lay wholly in the imagination of the writer is, of course, incredible. Whatever it was originally, Deuteronomy as we have it *now* is a thoroughly Judaean book; and it is inconceivable that any Jew should have gone out of his way to invent what is an evident glorification of Ebal and Gerizim. The only possible explanation is that the writer is using documents of extreme antiquity; and since Deuteronomy as a law-book is intimately associated with the Temple at Jerusalem, it is hardly rash to conjecture that these fragments belonged to the archives of the old Sanctuary of the Presence. The ancient Priesthood of this Sanctuary was, as we know, massacred by Saul, with the single exception of Abiathar who fled to David and was later placed by him in charge of the restored Ark. But the Sanctuary itself with its furniture and archives naturally continued to exist; and we have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the Chronicler who says that in Solomon's time it was to be found at Gibeon.[1] The Zadokites, who must thus have been the new priesthood appointed by Saul to replace the descendants of Eli, were transferred by Solomon to the Temple and combined there with the priests of the Ark led by Abiathar; it follows of necessity that they would have brought with them not merely their sacred furniture (such as the Table of the Presence-Bread, the lamps, &c.) but all the service-books which they had 'inherited' from their predecessors.

We can now understand the extraordinary value of these two fragments embedded in Deuteronomy. Though the writer has adapted them to his own use,

[1] 1 Chron. xvi. 39; 2 Chron. i. 3; cf. *Call of Israel*, pp. 96–103.

he does not succeed in disguising their original meaning, and we learn from them two things. First, when the Ark came to rest at 'the Gilgal' in the heart of the hill-country of Ephraim, this spot was at once recognized as the true religious centre of Israel. Here in particular the Covenant-Code was inscribed or painted upon large plastered stones, so that the whole People could learn it and teach it accurately to their children. Second, since the liturgy of the Blesssings and Curses would scarcely have been preserved in writing if it was only intended for use on a single occasion, it must be supposed that a ceremony of this description took place every year, as a continual reminder of the moral standard expected from Israel by its God.[1] When we add to this the law of the thrice-yearly pilgrimage (Exod. xxiii. 14–17, xxxiv. 23), which was no doubt observed more faithfully in the opening years of the Settlement than in later, more troubled days, we realize that the Sanctuary must have been not merely a focus of worship but a constant physical meeting-place of the People and the Presence.

This picture is admittedly vague and conjectural, but the point to be realized is that we cannot do without it. The archaeological evidence of Jericho, which is now accepted by experts as conclusive, proves that the city was destroyed and left desolate in about 1400 B.C. This means that, even if we allow a century for the Philistine Wars, which is almost certainly too much, the religious life of Israel was able to pursue its normal

[1] The fact that Levi is named among the rest of the tribes (Deut. xxvii. 12) shows the great antiquity of this ritual. The appointment of the Levites to the charge of the Sanctuary of the Presence seems to have been made by Saul after the massacre of Nob (*Call of Israel*, pp. 98–101).

course without serious interruption for not less than three hundred years. This is an extremely important point, though it usually passes unnoticed because no explicit mention of it is made in the Book of Judges. Moreover, it is to be noted that during the whole of this period (except possibly for an attack made by the Pharaoh Merneptah in 1224 B.C.) the heart of the hill-country of Ephraim never knew an invader; and it could be said of the Sanctuary of the Presence, as it was said later when it was transferred to the tribe of Benjamin:

> The Beloved of Jahweh shall 'tabernacle' in safety by him;
> He covereth him all the day long,
> And he 'tabernacleth' between his shoulders.
> (Deut. xxxiii. 12.)

What it meant for Israel, all through those centuries, to possess inviolate such a centre of its faith and worship is demonstrated in the clearest manner by the Song of Deborah. Here the most extraordinary ideas are still prevalent. We are asked by some scholars to believe that the northern tribes, Asher, Zebulon, and Naphtali, had either formed no part of the invasion under Joshua, or, if they had done so, had scattered at once to their various 'inheritances', to live there in almost total isolation from the rest. It may well be asked, if either of these theories is true, how two hundred years later and after twenty years of severe oppression two out of these three tribes should have rallied enthusiastically to the call of a prophetess in Mount Ephraim. Nor is this all; for Deborah's summons included the much more isolated tribes across Jordan, and it is quite clear from her sarcastic references to all those who failed to respond that they had known quite well where their duty lay

and had been expected to perform it as a matter of course. In other words, two centuries and more after the invasion of Canaan we find Israel in spite of the dispersion of its tribes a closely knit community, with a national self-consciousness which is based upon faith in, and loyalty to, Jahweh and which is revealed the more clearly by its partial failure. That this community was *created* by the events of the Exodus and the consummation of these at Horeb is evident; and those who reject the Tradition of the Twelve Tribes are left with an insoluble problem on their hands. But how was it *preserved* when once the tribes had divided the land between them? There can be only one answer. It is quite incredible that a people in so primitive a state of religious and social development should have maintained their religious and national coherence without a common religious and national centre. The Song of Deborah proves, in short, convincingly, that if we had known nothing about a central Sanctuary of Jahweh, we should have been forced to assume one.

We are now better able to deal with the question with which we started: how did the Israelite think of Jahweh, when he was offering his sacrifice at his own home-altar? For now we see that he must have had in his mind not only the memory of the great events of the past but the always-present consciousness of the God who 'tabernacled in the thick darkness' in the midst of His People. All this, indeed, made up for every Israelite the content of the Divine Name. When the Israelite thought of JAHWEH, it was in no vague or general manner; a fact which is hidden from many readers of the Bible by our English rendering of the

Name by the general terms 'Lord' and 'God'. Actually the name JAHWEH connoted for the Israelite the whole essence of Sacred History, past and present: it meant the Exodus, it meant the Covenant and the Ark, it meant the march from Horeb, the Crossing of Jordan and the Fate of Jericho, the victory of Beth-horon, the routing of Sisera, and all the other evidences of Divine Protection: but above all, and overshadowing all, it meant the Being, who, having led His People to their inheritance, dwelt with them *here on earth*, in *this* land which He had given to them for a possession.

It may perhaps appear that this point has been laboured overmuch, but it is one which has to be stressed with repeated emphasis, especially for readers of the Bible who are unfamiliar with the different ages of its documents. Such readers, finding a different and 'loftier' idea of God in many passages in the Pentateuch, are apt to jump to the conclusion that it represents the faith of Israel from the earliest times. Thus, for example, in the story of Manoah (Judges xiii) the 'angel of Jahweh' ascends heavenwards in the flame of the sacrifice, a conception which obviously pictures heaven as the dwelling-place of the God of Israel. But this and similar passages merely betray by these signs the late date of their composition: both in their attitude to heaven and in the reverential awe which leads them to imagine an angelic intermediary between the Israelite and the dreadful Presence of Jahweh, they mark a far more advanced stage of religious thought than that which we have already studied in Solomon's dedication-formula. *There* we can see not only what Solomon himself believed but what every Israelite must have believed for centuries before him: and

however much we are tempted to form a different picture, the facts bear a testimony too cogent to be ignored.

It may perhaps be thought presumptuous to claim, as we have done in the preceding sentence, that we can know what Israelites 'must' have believed in this earliest period. The truth is, however, that this word ought rather to be underlined; for the sequel will reveal its immense significance. It is, in fact, of the first importance to realize that all through its history *a 'necessity was laid upon' Israel.* Of this the Tradition is quite unshakably certain; and whatever modern theories may say against it, it remains true that Israel never wavered in this belief. Always it confessed that it neither invented its God nor accepted His Name and worship from another people, but on the contrary was found by Him, redeemed by Him, led by Him to the remote wilderness where His Sacred Mountain stood, and bound to Him there, as a peculiar possession, by the mysterious rite of a Covenant. Now this is, in effect, a Creed as definite, specific, and historical as that of the New Israel itself; exactly like that other faith, it is based on certain facts of experience, which must be accepted, wrestled with, and as far as possible interpreted, but which must not be denied, evaded, or explained away.

It is both interesting and for our purpose important to follow this parallel a little farther. The Church very soon discovered what depths of mystery lay behind the brief statements of the Apostles' Creed: indeed, almost from the first it had to face the problem of our Lord's dual Nature, which became the subject of a long and bitter controversy. Through all this controversy the

Church held fast to that which had been 'delivered' (Jude 3), rejecting in turn all the theories, however outwardly attractive, which sought to solve the problem by evading the mystery from which it issued, and thus in effect denying the 'given' truths of the Faith. In the end it was found necessary simply to affirm our Lord's Godhead side by side with His Manhood as a mystery which the reason of man cannot penetrate but which faith must embrace without wavering: and there the problem has remained ever since. But this does not mean that the controversy was a wholly barren one, for it brought to light the principle which must govern all theological speculation. The Christian may not pick and choose what he is to believe when he confronts the mysteries of his religion: a necessity is laid upon him; and if he ignores it, he is inviting disaster.

In the next chapter we shall see how an almost exactly similar problem arose out of the 'given' facts to perplex the faith of the Old Israel; and we shall see later on how in spite of the difficulties of thought which they thus created, the belief enshrined in them was never for a moment abandoned. Confronted with a dualism not fundamentally different from that which provoked the Christological controversy, the religious leaders of the Nation held to their Creed with a constancy not less firm than that of the Early Church. 'And these all, having had witness borne to them through their faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing concerning us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect.'

Chapter III

THE DUALISM OF COVENANT-THEOLOGY

WHEN a man thinks of 'God', he naturally looks upwards. His remote predecessors may not always have done so in the past, but even if they began by finding their gods in trees, in stones, in mountains, or in the mysterious life of the Earth-mother itself, this phase of thought was always sooner or later superseded. Very often this happened when a number of different tribal, national, or territorial deities were combined for political reasons into a pantheon. This produced a complicated mythology in which one god dominated, or at least was enthroned above, the rest; and the very fact of this greater exaltation of the supreme being made it natural to think of him as dwelling with his divine household far above the earth. So little by little the old sense of the nearness of gods and man began to fade; the Olympus on earth became the Olympus in heaven; above all, the belief in a divine spirit immanent in all nature gave way to the belief in a Power which transcended the universe.

This process, or at least its consummation, can be seen very clearly in all the great ancient religions of the Near East, in Egypt, in Mesopotamia, in the Hittite Empire, and, most recently, in Syria (Ras Shamra). In the last of these, indeed, something very much like monotheism seems to have been reached by the fourteenth century B.C., although a shadowy pantheon still existed by the side of the supreme god, El. It is not, however, the development from polytheism to monotheism which here concerns us.

What we want to note is that, as a result of this development, faith and worship are carried irresistibly upwards. It becomes intolerable to think of 'God' as having a dwelling-place among men: he (or they) must live in some infinitely remote and lofty abode.

Does this change of the divine *habitat* mark an advance in religious thought? Such a question hardly needs answering. This direction of the thoughts to 'heaven' raises man from his innate leanings towards pantheism and brings him sooner or later to worship One God, the Creator of the universe and the Moral Ruler of all the nations of the earth. Even Hinduism, in its 'spiritualized' form, teaches this lesson, though its emphasis on divine immanence remains fundamental. Equally informative, on the other side, are those regressions towards the pantheistic idea of which modern Germany provides numerous examples. The result of these, as we are witnessing almost every day, is a complete denial of any universal moral obligations.[1] We may say in short that the instinct to think of God as in 'heaven' is not merely natural to man in his less primitive state but is a necessary stage in his progress to greater spiritual truth. If he never reaches this stage his soul must remain stunted; if he falls back from it he must revert to barbarism.

These remarks are intended to set the religious problem of Israel in its true perspective. Israel, as a Nation, never passed through the stage of polytheism, whatever the faith of its patriarchal ancestors may have been; but it did begin its history, as we have already repeatedly remarked, with a belief that its God

[1] A brief study of these mythologies can be found in Frey, *Cross and Swastika*, 1938.

dwelt on earth in the midst of His People. It is true that this fact was not signified as it was amongst the surrounding nations. There was no idol of Jahweh, but simply the Sacred Ark as the 'focal manifestation' of His Presence. It is true also, as the words used by Solomon show us, that this 'tabernacling' of Jahweh was even from the first regarded as a paradox of Divine condescension. All this is important as indicating the uniqueness of the faith of Israel, but it is not immediately relevant. If, for example, the early Israelite had been asked where he imagined Jahweh to have dwelt before He made the Covenant, he would probably have replied that he had never given the subject any thought, because it was of no consequence. What mattered was the simple historical fact that from Horeb onwards Jahweh had been *here*.

Such unreflective piety would have been sufficient in the earliest period of the Settlement, but the time was bound to come when it would be superseded. Before, however, we follow the probable stages of this process we may consider an interesting illustration of its effect upon the text of the Bible. Immediately after the dedication-formula which we have already studied there follows a long and noble prayer in which Solomon presents the Temple to Jahweh and implores His continual assistance for those who pray there. That this prayer (1 Kings viii. 14–53) is an extremely late interpolation is proved by the fact that in the Septuagint it precedes instead of following the formula, but its own internal evidence would lead us to the same conclusion; for its outlook is the very reverse of that found in the far more ancient fragment. There the paradox of Jahweh's condescension lies in His deliberate

choice of an earthly dwelling-place; here that dwelling-place is explicitly described as 'heaven' (viii. 30, &c.) and the idea of God's dwelling in a 'house' built by man is mentioned only to be set aside as unthinkable (viii. 27):

> But will God in very deed dwell on the earth?
> Behold heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee;
> How much less this house that I have builded.

To us these words express a perfectly natural religious sentiment. But they are a complete contradiction of what Solomon is supposed to have said himself a few moments before; and no wonder! for in reality at least five centuries of religious development separate the two statements. We shall have occasion to return to this prayer later on, and we shall find then that it marks the end of one line of Israelite thought, in which the belief in the 'tabernacling' Presence has almost disappeared. But what of the intervening stages? It is these which we must now consider.

It will be evident, to begin with, from what we have already seen, that we shall find no light on our problem in the Northern Kingdom. We may blame this if we will, with the Deuteronomic editors, upon Jeroboam son of Nebat 'who made Israel to sin'; but in truth the guilt rests quite as much upon Solomon. It was as a result of his tyranny that the Sacred Ark ceased to be the true focus of worship for the revolting tribes, and whatever may be said of Jeroboam's 'calves', it is difficult to see how he could have allowed his subjects to do homage in the hostile capital of Jerusalem. There can be no doubt, however, that the loss of the Central Sanctuary was a disastrous one for the northern tribes.

The times were far too young for a purely 'spiritual' worship to be possible, and no outward and visible symbol of Jahweh's Presence could take the place of the Ark. It is not surprising, therefore, that these tribes fell an easy victim to the baalim and leaving the immemorial Focus of the Covenant worship lapsed also from the moral standards of the Covenant-Code.

The Kingdom of Judah was in very different case, and it is here that we naturally find our chief source of information. Here the ancient Sanctuary of the Presence continued to exist for three and a half centuries after the Disruption, till it became inseparable in thought from the idea of the Temple in which it had found its last and most permanent resting-place. But what exactly do we mean by this word 'Temple'? As it can be used in two quite different senses (a fact which is too often overlooked), it is very necessary to distinguish these clearly. To put it in Greek terminology which we shall find of great use to us when we pass on to the New Testament, a 'Temple' normally consisted of two things, a 'Hieron' and a 'Naos'. The 'Hieron', as its name indicates, was a general term for the whole 'Sacred' enclosure, but it stood in particular for the system of courts and buildings which surrounded the central Naos and in which the sacrifices were offered and the public at large worshipped. The 'Temple' proper, the focal point of the sacred enclosure, was the 'Naos' which was the 'house' of the god or goddess.[1]

We have an excellent illustration of this distinction in Lucian's description of the 'Hieron' and 'Naos' of

[1] A pagan 'Hieron' might, of course, include more than one 'Naos'; familiar examples are Baalbek and the Acropolis at Athens.

Derceto at Hierapolis in North Syria; and Solomon's Temple at Jerusalem, which was built on the Syrian model, is another example of the same kind. Here the 'Hieron' consisted of the Place of Sacrifice immediately in front of the 'Naos' of Jahweh and of the various courts and colonnades allotted to the priests, the laymen, and their womenfolk: all these were as usual focused on the 'Temple' proper, the Naos (*Hekal*), which faced eastwards. This 'Naos', as is well known, was divided internally into two parts; or rather, to be more exact, it contained within it at its western-most end a large boxed-in shrine whose ceiling was 10 cubits (15 ft.) lower than the roof of the Naos itself. The space to the east of this shrine, while it was naturally still called the *Hekal*, was also known as 'the Holy Place'; and here the priests came regularly to tend the lamps and renew the Bread of the Presence (E.V. '*Shew-bread*') and (in later days) to offer incense. The shrine itself, called in Solomon's temple the *Debir* (E.V. 'Oracle') and also the 'Most Holy Place' ('Holy of Holies'), was in the form of a cube 20 cubits each way, and was separated from the 'Holy Place' not as later by a veil but by a partition, the nature and thickness of which are not stated. This was provided with two doors of olive wood, the lintel and posts of which apparently formed a pentagon, to suggest perhaps, like the carrying-poles already alluded to, the ancient idea of a movable tent.

In the 'Oracle' itself there was nothing but the Ark. According to the Priestly writers (Exod. xxv. 10) this was a chest of acacia wood about 3 ft. 9 in. long, 2 ft. 3 in. wide, and 2 ft. 3 in. deep; and it was covered with a slab of solid gold (the so-called 'Mercy-Seat',

Kapporeth), in the ends of which were inserted two golden Cherubim, who faced one another and covered the Ark with their wings. In the description of Solomon's Temple there is no mention of any such golden plate, while the Cherubim are stated to have been figures, 15 ft. high, of olive wood overlaid with gold, their faces being turned to the doors and their inner wings only meeting above the Ark. How these two different accounts arose we have no means of knowing, but their very discrepancy is of interest because it shows how strong the tradition was which associated the Ark, as a *throne*, with the winged figures of Cherubim. 'Jahweh Sabaoth who thrones upon the Cherubim' is a title that occurs as early as the time of David, or at least in a document not later than the reign of Solomon (2 Sam. vi. 2) and which is thereafter used repeatedly (1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Kings xix. 15; Isa. xxxvii. 16; Ps. lxxx. 1, xcix. 1, &c.). This being so, it is possible that, even though it is not mentioned, there may have been already in the first Temple a special golden covering for the Ark, which only much later received the name of the 'Propitiatory' (*Kapporeth*).

The position of the Ark in the 'Oracle' can be conjectured with some probability, if the description of the Cherubim is to be taken as accurate. Since the wings of these are said to have covered the whole expanse of the back (west) wall, i.e. 20 cubits, they must have stood 10 cubits (15 ft.) apart, leaving this amount of space between them for the Ark. This means that the Ark itself stood broadwise, not lengthwise, as indeed would be the most natural way if it was now regarded as a throne; and the fact that its carrying-poles are said to have been so long that they could be seen from

the outer chamber (the Holy Place) suggests that it was actually transported in this way when it led the armies of David to war. We have thus another indirect but interesting hint as to the date when this change of thought took place. In an earlier study of the *theologumena* of the Covenant I have ventured the suggestion that when David restored the Ark to its old place of honour, some such change must of necessity have occurred.[1] When the Ark was captured by the Philistines it must have contained the original stones from Horeb which were still identified with the Presence of Jahweh; but when it was sent back by them to Israel, it returned empty. If, then, it was ever to be used again as the palladium of Jahweh, two things must happen: it must receive new contents (these were the Tables of Stone on which the Ten Words were now inscribed), and it must assume a new relation to the Presence, which could now no longer be regarded as 'tabernacling' inside it. Meanwhile, however (as I have argued), a new theology of the Presence had been worked out and taught by Samuel, who discounted the loss of the Ark by recalling the other traditional Vehicle of the Presence, the Pillar of Cloud and Fire. This itself provided a 'thick darkness' in which Jahweh invisibly dwelt; and doubtless if the Ark had never been restored to honour, this *theologumenon* would have permanently taken its place. As a result of David's action, however, another course had to be followed. The Cloud must remain within its Sanctuary as the abiding Darkness of Jahweh, while the Ark borne out on successive campaigns must be thought of as the throne on which He invisibly journeyed. When,

[1] *The Call of Israel*, pp. 80–103.

finally, the Ark was installed in the 'Oracle' of the Temple, it retained naturally this newly acquired character of a throne, while the Cloud continued to be the Vehicle of the 'Glory', as the Presence came later to be called.[1]

Such a reconstruction of the course of events must necessarily be tentative, but the facts themselves call for it. Explain it how we will, we have to account somehow for the strange parallelism which makes the Ark and the Cloud at one time rivals of one another (cf. Num. x. 33–4), and we have to find some reason for the equally strange conversion of the Ark from a chest to a throne. Theories, however, apart, these facts are in themselves immensely significant: *they mark the appearance of a new conception of the Presence.* This does not mean that Jahweh is no longer regarded as 'tabernacling' within the 'Oracle', but it does mean that the mode of His 'tabernacling' has become infinitely more mysterious. An empty throne overshadowed by strange winged figures, and all around it the darkness of a Divine Cloud, this is an imagery tremendously potent in its suggestiveness; and we cannot wonder that Israel for nearly a millennium needed no more.

That it needed *no less* became, however, with the passing of the centuries an equal certainty. Religious ideas no doubt developed slowly, especially in the Kingdom of Judah which under Jehoshaphat and the priest Jehoiada adhered strictly to the old forms of Covenant-worship. But with the prophet Amos in the middle of the eighth century we find ourselves entering a new world of thought. This does not involve, so far as Amos himself is concerned, a new conception of the

[1] Cf. 1 Kings viii. 6–11.

'tabernacling' Presence; for Jahweh is spoken of as 'roaring from Zion' (Am. i. 2), a phrase which implies that He dwells there in the full totality of His Being. Nevertheless, it was inevitable that Amos' conception of the God of Israel as the moral ruler and judge of all the surrounding nations as well as of His own People should have its natural effect of lifting the eyes upwards. So great a majesty demands of thought, irresistibly, a greater dwelling-place, and that not on earth but in some watch-tower which from far above overlooks all the movements of the human race. Whether it was of such a dwelling-place that Hosea (743–727) was thinking when he spoke of Jahweh withdrawing Himself from Israel (v. 15) must remain uncertain, but may be regarded as probable; to him as to other Northern Israelites, separated for centuries from the Sanctuary of the Presence, such a conception must have come with far less difficulty than to those for whom it had remained the focal point of religion. What is much more remarkable, precisely for this reason, is that we find this thought appearing in prophecies from the Kingdom of Judah.

Here, as will be evident, a special problem presented itself. To think of Jahweh, the world-ruler, as dwelling in 'heaven' might well seem to the finest religious minds in Jerusalem the only worthy way of conceiving His greatness; yet the very Name Jahweh itself connoted something quite specific and quite different, His 'tabernacling' on earth amongst His People. How was this dilemma to be solved? We find the first stage of the answer in Isaiah son of Amoz and Micah (*c.* 740–700). The second of these, it is true, takes refuge in ambiguity, but this in itself reveals the tension behind his thought:

Hear, ye peoples all of you;
Hearken, O earth, and all that therein is:
And let the Lord Jahweh be witness against you,
Jahweh from his holy 'Naos'.
For, behold, Jahweh cometh forth out of his place,
And will come down, and tread upon the high places of the earth. . . .' (Mic. i. 2–3*a*.)

It has been held by some scholars that Micah's reference here to the 'holy Naos' (*Hekal*) of Jahweh is clearly intended to mean 'heaven', as the following lines certainly seem to imply, yet there can be little doubt, having regard to the date of this prophecy and its authorship, that Professor Theodore Robinson is in the right when he says that it must be taken literally. 'As with other pre-exilic prophets', he writes (citing Amos i. 2, i. 3—ii. 3, ix. 7, and Isa. vi. 3, x. 5 ff., viii. 18), 'so also here the two stand side by side: the universality of Jahweh's Lordship and its intimate connexion with the Temple at Jerusalem. This Temple is admittedly the place out of which Jahweh speaks, but His words are intended for all peoples.'[1] This is, however, not quite all that needs to be said, for it overlooks the reference to Jahweh's 'coming down' upon the high places of the earth. It would, perhaps, be more accurate to say that, while Micah still regards the Temple as the 'place' where Jahweh dwells, he is thinking of the Presence as so vast and glorious that on leaving Its Sanctuary It at once fills the heavens and descends from thence in terrible majesty upon all the nations.

This is certainly the thought which is present in the

[1] Th. H. Robinson, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten* (Tübingen, 1936), p. 131.

mind of Isaiah. Like every other inhabitant of the holy city, he has no doubt that Jahweh Sabaoth 'tabernacles' in Mount Zion (viii. 18), but in his great vision of the Presence (vi. 1–4) he realizes that the Naos cannot possibly contain Its Glory:

In the year that King Uzziah died,
I saw Jahweh sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up,
And his skirts filled the 'Naos'.
Above him stood the seraphim:
Each one had six wings;
With twain he covered his face,
And with twain he covered his feet,
And with twain he did fly,
And one cried unto another, and said,
Holy, holy, holy is Jahweh Sabaoth:
The whole earth is full of his Glory.
And the foundations of the thresholds were moved at the voice of him that cried,
And the house was filled with smoke.

It requires little reflection to see that the tension between the earthly and the heavenly dwelling-place of Jahweh has been strained in this passage almost to breaking-point. There is a throne here, but it is a throne high and lifted up, not the Ark-throne within the 'Oracle'; there are winged forms here, but they are not the familiar Cherubim between whom Jahweh was wont to be seated, they are six-winged and flaming figures who stand *above* Him and yet with veiled faces adore His Holiness. Nothing, in fact, is left here of earthly surroundings but the Naos which in its entirety is scarcely able to contain the skirts of His raiment, and which quakes to its foundations at the sound of a single seraphic cry. Yet the prophet who proclaims

that in this vision his 'eyes have seen the King, Jahweh Sabaoth' is the same man who hurls defiance at the Assyrians, because 'the fire of Jahweh is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem' (xxxi. 9).

One further passage from Isaiah deserves attention, because it foreshadows the next development of thought about the Presence:

> Behold the Name of Jahweh cometh from far,
> Burning with his anger,
> And in thick rising smoke:
> His lips are full of indignation,
> And his tongue is as a devouring fire:
> And his breath is as an overflowing stream, that reacheth even to the neck,
> To sift the nations with the sieve of vanity:
> And a bridle that causeth to err shall be in the jaws of the peoples. (xxx. 27–8.)

We have already seen what the Covenant-Name meant from the first to every Israelite, and there is no need to cite the numerous passages which illustrate this significance. But now we find ourselves on the threshold of a deeper thought. Here the Name is something much more than 'the expression of the character, the connotation of the Divine attributes, in so far as these have become known to the Israelites, or have manifested themselves for their protection or deliverance'; it has become 'really a personified power placed side by side with the proper person of Jahweh', a power 'which has become hypostatized in it'.[1] In this short prophecy (for it is not connected by its metre with what follows it and is much earlier in date than the preceding section, xxx. 18–26) Isaiah imagines himself in the

[1] Kautzsch, partly citing Giesebrecht, *H.D.B.*, vol. v, pp. 640–1.

place of the peoples of the earth upon whom the Name descends in raging anger: they had thought themselves safe enough from this God who dwelt in distant Zion, and lo! in a moment He is upon them. It should be said that this is not the interpretation of the passage which is commonly accepted. Some scholars take 'cometh from far' to mean 'from Sinai', but this, as we have seen, makes nonsense of the whole theology of the Covenant. Others, again, refer it to 'heaven', but in this case Isaiah would surely have said 'Cometh down', a phrase which he actually uses in another place (xxxi. 4), when he is 'looking upwards'. There is, however, another and much weightier argument, of which neither of these views takes account, namely that the Name was from the first asssociated intimately with the *theologumena* of the Covenant, and later, as a natural result, with the Temple at Jerusalem.

We may recall at this point the story of David's proposal to build a 'house of cedar' for Jahweh, and the message which Nathan received the same night forbidding him to do so (2 Sam. vii. 1–17). This message in its original form excluded the possibility of any such 'house' being built at any time by any ruler of Israel, but it has been adapted by means of an interpolation to provide Divine approval for Solomon's *fait accompli*. After saying that Jahweh would appoint a permanent resting-place for His People, so that they should be 'moved no more' (in contrast to His own Will to 'tabernacle' and 'walk' among them), the message ended with a promise to make a 'house', i.e. a dynasty, for David, and to establish the kingdom for his 'seed', i.e. for his descendants. This purely general reference has, however, been twisted by the insertion of a single

verse (vii. 13), according to which the 'seed' is limited to Solomon, and it is stated, in complete contradiction of what has been said just before:

> 'He shall build an house for my Name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son.'

The full significance of this interpolation (a prophecy worthy to be ranked with that of Caiaphas!) will become apparent in the second part of this book. What immediately concerns us is, first, that its date must be a comparatively early one since it was already known to the Deuteronomic editors of the Books of Kings,[1] and, second, that it speaks expressly of the Temple as a 'house' built 'for the Name'. This phrase marks an extremely important development in the theological thought of Israel; and whether this particular document was earlier or later than the utterance of Isaiah xxx. 27–8, it is difficult to believe that he was unaware of it. The doctrine which it illustrates is stated clearly in the hortatory epilogue appended to the Covenant Code in Exodus:

> 'Behold, I send an angel before thee, to keep thee by the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Take ye heed of him, and hearken unto his voice; provoke him not: for he will not pardon your transgression; for My Name is in him. But if thou wilt indeed hearken unto his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries.'
>
> (Exod. xxiii. 20–2.)

That this passage did not belong to the Code is evident.

[1] Kennedy, *I and II Samuel* (Century Bible), p. 226; Skinner, *I and II Kings* (Century Bible), p. 145.

As Driver has said, 'It is remarkable that the commands which Israel is to obey are not those embodied in ch. xx. 22—xxiii. 19 but (verse 22) those to be given it in the *future* by the angel on the way to Canaan. Perhaps the passage was written originally for a different context.'[1] This indeed might be the explanation but for the fact that the 'angel' is mentioned again, most significantly, after the sin of the Golden Calf. The story of this act of apostasy cannot be earlier than the reign of Jeroboam I, of whose 'sin' it is an overt echo;[2] it reflects, in other words, the theological ideas prevalent in Jerusalem (and more especially at the Temple) after the Disruption. When, therefore, we read that Jahweh promises to send His 'angel' before Israel in spite of its iniquity (Exod. xxxii. 34), we must not dismiss this statement as 'a gloss' but must regard it as indicating a profound change of thought about the Presence. It has become impossible to remain satisfied with the simple unqualified belief that Jahweh 'tabernacles' amongst Israel in the thick darkness of the 'Oracle'. The growing consciousness of Israel's sin on the one hand and of Jahweh's sublime Holiness on the other have proved too strong for this archaic and ingenuous conception. Yet the facts of Sacred History cannot be ignored and the belief in the 'tabernacling' Presence cannot lightly be abandoned. It must therefore be assumed that though the Presence is not, strictly speaking, Jahweh Himself, it is an 'Angel' who in the fullest sense represents Him, because the Covenant-Name is 'in him'.

Traces of the conflict of thought which resulted

[1] Driver, S. R., *Exodus* (Cambridge Bible), p. 247.
[2] *The Call of Israel*, pp. 108–10.

from this and its solution are very evident in Exod. xxxiii. 1–3 and 12–16, where Jahweh is at first distinguished from His 'angel' ('I will send my angel . . . for I will not go up in the midst of them') and then identified with him ('My Presence shall go with thee'). They may also account for the divergence between the Hebrew and the Greek text of Isa. lxiii. 9, where the former speaks of the 'angel of His Presence' saving Israel, while the latter reads: 'neither a messenger nor an angel *but* His Presence.' Such differences of thought and expression were, in fact, inevitable. Strict monotheism could not tolerate the idea of a Presence on earth distinct from, and yet in all respects equal to, the Presence in 'heaven'; yet at the same time this dualism was irresistibly demanded by the sacrosanct *theologumena* of the Covenant. Centuries later we find this same ambiguity echoed in an utterance with which the whole world would become familiar:

> Behold, I send my messenger,
> And he shall prepare the way before me:
> And the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his 'Naos',
> Even the Angel of the Covenant, whom ye delight in.
> (Mal. iii. i.)

Meanwhile, however, as we can gather from Deuteronomy, the thought of the Presence as the 'Angel' of Jahweh faded into the background. No doubt it was felt that no 'Angel' could 'tabernacle' in the Most Holy Place. Only Jahweh could be thought of in this hallowed connexion: it must therefore be of 'Jahweh' that this act was predicated. So we reach yet another stage of this process, that in which the NAME, almost hypostatized, is 'caused' by Jahweh to 'tabernacle' in

the Naos. This is the common usage of the writers of Deuteronomy (Deut. xiv. 23; xvi. 2, 6, 11; xxvi. 2), though it is varied by the expression that the Name is 'put' there by Jahweh (Deut. xii. 5, 21). Probably this second phrase is intended to convey the same meaning, but the first is quite unambiguous; and it need hardly be said that it must be taken seriously. In such a context to 'tabernacle' means only one thing, and that not figuratively but in literal and awful actuality.[1]

We may sum up briefly the results of this survey. We have found the Doctrine of the 'tabernacling' Presence passing through three stages. First this Presence is conceived quite naïvely as Jahweh Himself, who, although the Maker of the heavens and earth, has willed for His People's sake to dwell and to walk in their midst. At this stage the Presence is associated first with the Ark, then with the Cloud, and finally, the Ark having become a throne, with both of these together in the 'thick darkness' of the 'Oracle' of the Naos. The second stage begins with the gradual realization of Jahweh's sublime Holiness and a corresponding consciousness of the sinfulness of Israel. Now the eyes are lifted spontaneously upwards; and 'heaven' becomes the natural dwelling-place for such a God. Since, however, at the same time the ancient and sacrosanct *theologumena* of the Covenant continue to exercise their constraining influence, it becomes essential to ease the tension of thought by seeking for some adequate earthly representatives of Jahweh: the solution found in the thought of the Angel of the Presence or of the Covenant (since these two, as we have seen, are really

[1] This point is of great importance when we read the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel. See below, p. 221.

identical). This conception, though it was never altogether abandoned (witness Malachi), yields in time to another which suggests a more intimate connexion between Jahweh and His earthly 'Presence'. So we reach the third stage in which the NAME, later to become ineffable in the most literal sense, is 'caused' by Jahweh to 'tabernacle' in the 'place' which He has chosen.

Here the dualism of Covenant-theology has reached its fullest development, but before we go on to consider how it was dealt with by later generations, one more word must be said about its nature. This problem which we are studying is in no sense a matter of pure dialectic: neither metaphysical nor any other kind of philosophy has anything whatever to do with it. It is a simple straightforward conflict between the natural religious instincts on the one hand and the objective inescapable facts of Sacred History on the other. Must one of these yield to the other or could they be held together without each of them losing its own peculiar virtue? That was the question, and only an inspired and resolute faith could hope to answer it aright. We shall see in the two next chapters how near at one moment the cause came to shipwreck and how against all hopes it was saved.

Chapter IV

JEREMIAH

THE dualism which we have been studying owed its existence to the facts of Sacred History; facts which were commemorated in solid objective form both by the Ark itself and by the Temple in which it 'rested'. While these remained, it was impossible for Israel to abandon its belief in the 'tabernacling' Presence, however hard it might be to reconcile this with 'heavenly' conceptions of Jahweh. But what if the Ark should disappear, the Sanctuary of the Presence be violated, the Holy City laid waste, and the Nation carried off to captivity out of Jahweh's heritage? Would this ancient and apparently obsolete belief survive the shock of such a series of disasters?

It is difficult even to-day to approach this question without some prejudice of our own. We have the feeling that the belief ought *not* to have survived, and that in actually doing so it gravely hampered the development of Israelite religion. In other words, we take sides instinctively with what is sometimes called 'spiritual' religion, forgetting that to pray to God in 'heaven' is not a whit more 'spiritual' than to worship Him at His 'tabernacle' on earth. As a result of this, we are in danger of forcing our own religious inclinations upon the Bible, instead of learning from it with humility and patience what true religion ought to be. A notable instance of this rashness is to be seen in what may almost be called the 'standard treatment' of Jeremiah, whose evidence we have now to consider. Jeremiah is usually acclaimed as the greatest representative of

'spiritual' religion in the Old Testament, but what exactly does this mean? If it simply means that Jeremiah himself enjoyed an intimacy of communion with God which has been granted to few others, then the word 'spiritual' may be rightly used here. But if it means that Jeremiah taught an exclusively 'heavenwards' religion, then we must ask that this statement shall be severely scrutinized. Putting prejudice aside, the questions which we have to answer are these: Did Jeremiah himself believe in the 'tabernacling' Presence? Did he expect its *theologumena* to disappear after the destruction of Jerusalem?

Did Jeremiah himself believe in the 'tabernacling' Presence? It is well to put this question first, for it helps to clear up a certain confusion of mind which has been created by the misleading use of the word 'spiritual' already referred to. The suggestion, latent or otherwise, in this use of the word is that such a belief must necessarily be 'unspiritual' and that therefore a man like Jeremiah cannot have entertained it. Hence it is agreed that passages in which any reference to the Presence occur cannot be Jeremianic! The mistake here is the mistake which has so often been made in matters of Christian theology, that of confusing a belief or doctrine with low and materialistic interpretations of it. It cannot be too often emphasized that the belief in the Presence is not to be described as 'unspiritual' simply because Its 'tabernacle' was material. To believe that Jahweh was enthroned above the Ark might well involve difficulties of thought, when He was conceived at the same time as One who filled the heavens and the earth (Jer. xxiii. 24); but it is actually neither more nor less 'spiritual' than to believe

that the Word was made flesh, though all things were made by Him. If the reader is not able to concede this, he had better lay this book aside; for its central theme is that the second of these mysteries is the consummation of the first.

We may now press our question without danger of begging it, and the available evidence seems to leave no doubt of the answer. Jeremiah was a priest 'of the priests that were in Anathoth', and since this was the village to which Abiathar, the great-grandson of Eli, was banished by Solomon (1 Kings ii. 26), it is possible that Jeremiah was himself of the same ancient lineage. But whether he was actually descended from the first guardians of the Ark or not, it is hardly likely that he would be indifferent to the belief of which the Ark was the visible expression. Nor is this simply a matter of conjecture. He tells us that he was bidden by Jahweh to stand in the gate of 'Jahweh's house' (which in this context means the Hieron, not the Naos), and to warn all the inhabitants of Judah who entered to worship there that if they would not amend their ways not even the presence of His Sanctuary in their midst would save them:

> 'But go ye now unto my place which was in Shiloh, where I caused my Name to tabernacle at the first, and see what I did to it for the wickedness of my people Israel. And now, because ye have done all these works, saith Jahweh, and I spake unto you, rising up early and speaking, but ye heard not; and I called you, but ye answered not: therefore will I do unto this house, upon which my Name is called, wherein ye trust, and unto the place which I gave unto you and your fathers, as I have done unto Shiloh. And I will cast you out of my sight, as

I have cast out all your brethren, even the whole seed of Ephraim.' (Jer. vii. 12–15.)

This prophecy is dated (cf. xxvi. 1) to 'the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah', and since it was in Josiah's reign that Deuteronomy was promulgated, it is natural that Jeremiah should use the typical Deuteronomic *theologumenon* of the 'tabernacling' Name. There is, moreover, no doubt that he regards the Presence as identical with Jahweh Himself. Jahweh has always '*tabernacled*' amongst His People: He has refused to be bound to any one fixed and permanent spot, and when His Sanctuary in one place has been profaned by the wickedness of Israel, He has removed to another. This is what happened to Shiloh, and this, too, is what will happen to the Naos in Jerusalem, if Judah does not repent. It is useless for the people to rely on the teaching of Deuteronomy about the unique sanctity of this Naos, as if its very stones, by conferring a similar sanctity on the whole Hieron, must always save it from destruction (vii. 4). They have to learn that their own evil deeds have so profaned the Temple that unless they amend their ways the Presence of Jahweh will forsake it, and He will even cast Judah 'out of His sight'.

All this is so clear that if some of the other references to the Presence are more dubious, they must be judged on other grounds. Whether, for example, Jeremiah would ever have called the Naos 'the throne of thy Glory' (xiv. 21, xvii. 12)[1] is doubtful, since this is not the *theologumenon* which he normally uses. On the

[1] Jer. iii. 17 must also be late, because it calls *Jerusalem*, not the Naos, the 'throne of Jahweh' and speaks of 'all the nations' being gathered to it, a thought which is typical of post-exilic prophecy but is not found elsewhere in Jeremiah.

other hand, the familiar passage (xiv. 9) 'Thou, Jahweh, art in the midst of us and we are called by Thy Name' is thoroughly characteristic of him and cannot lightly be rejected. So, too, the cry (viii. 19) 'Is not Jahweh in Zion? is not her King in her?' occurs in a context which suggests the Exile; yet, as Peake has said, there are few passages in the book which bear more certain signs of Jeremianic origin.[1] For our present purpose, however, these debates are of secondary importance; for, as Peake himself has recognized, Jeremiah quite evidently held to 'the old conception of Jahweh as localized in Palestine'.[2] This is, in fact, the only possible meaning of the expression 'I will cast you out of my sight', and it is one repeatedly used by Jeremiah:

> 'Then said Jahweh unto me, though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people: cast them out of my sight, and let them go forth. And it shall come to pass, when they say unto thee, Whither shall we go forth? then thou shalt tell them, Thus saith Jahweh: such as are for death, to death; and such as are for the sword, to the sword; and such as are for the famine, to the famine; and such as are for captivity, to captivity.' (xv. 1–2.)

So again:

> 'Because your fathers have forsaken me, saith Jahweh, and have walked after other gods, and have served them, and have worshipped them, and have forsaken me, and have not kept my law . . . therefore will I cast you out of this land into the land that ye have not known, neither ye nor your fathers; and there shall ye serve other gods day and night; for I will shew you no favour.' (xvi. 11–13.)

[1] Peake, A. S., *Jeremiah* (Century Bible), vol. i, p. 162.
[2] Op. cit., p. 149.

And again:

> 'When this people, or the prophet, or a priest shall ask thee, saying, what is the burden of Jahweh, thou shalt say unto them, What burden! I will cast you off, saith Jahweh. . . .
>
> 'Behold I will utterly forget you, and I will cast you off, and the city that I gave unto you and to your fathers, away from my Presence.' (xxiii. 33, 39.)

In all these passages Jahweh is pictured as remaining in His Land, while He drives His People out of it; and the reason given is always the same. Israel has defiled its heritage by forsaking Jahweh and worshipping 'other gods' (i. 16; ii. 17–19; v. 7, 19, &c.). The Land has been polluted by its sins (ii. 7, 20, 23; iii. 2, 6, 9; xvi. 18). The Valley of Hinnom has been 'estranged' with 'innocent blood' (xix. 4). The Temple itself has been profaned with abominations, both sacrificial and moral (vii. 30–1; xxiii. 11; xxxii. 34; xxxiv. 16). Therefore Jahweh forsakes His 'house' and casts off His heritage; He gives the dearly beloved of His Soul into the hand of her enemies, who will destroy His vineyard and make it a desolation (xii. 7 f.), yet He Himself does not leave the Land, and will punish those 'evil neighbours' who touch it (xii. 14); more than this, He will one day bring back His People to their old inheritance and renew there His Covenant with them.

This brings us to our second question, how Jeremiah pictured the Presence after the destruction of the Temple; but we may note, before we pass on, that his message, as outlined above, is simply a repetition of what all the prophets had declared from Amos onwards: Israel has 'profaned Jahweh's Holy Name',

therefore it must suffer the darkness of His terrible Day (cf. Amos ii. 6–16, &c.). Jeremiah himself is very conscious of this fact. He has no new message to give, no new religious ideas to expound: he is simply one of a long line of messengers, whom Jahweh has sent ('rising early and sending them') to a perpetually backsliding and rebellious people who know His law and yet stubbornly refuse to obey it. Like his predecessors, Jeremiah gives a twofold picture of Israel's sin; on the one hand gross and shameless idolatry, on the other every form of personal and social immorality. And, like them, he exposes the utter futility of thinking to delude or placate Jahweh by continuing to offer Him the official sacrifices (vi. 20; vii. 21). On this last point it may be useful to quote some words of Dr. Welch, who has done much to modify the old distinction between 'prophetic' and 'priestly' religion:

'The prophet [Jeremiah] was speaking to, and dealing with, a peculiar situation. Because his people were laying too great emphasis on the actual cult of their time and were drawing the conclusion that God must preserve the temple where alone that cult could be duly performed, he must insist on the relative worth of the two factors of their ancestral faith. The ethical and spiritual elements of that faith were absolute and immutable, but the outward forms of worship were capable of being adapted in order to meet the needs of a changed time.'[1]

Dr. Welch rightly protests in his book against the exaggerated condemnation of the Israelite cultus of which some scholars have been guilty and which they claim to find in the writings of the prophets. He points out that if this cultus had really been of no

[1] A. C. Welch, *Prophet and Priest in Old Israel*, 1936, p. 48.

spiritual value, it is strange that it should have been resumed after the Exile. Moreover, since it was the Priestly editors who preserved the 'oracles' of these very prophets, it is clear that they did not regard them as having demanded the abolition of the sacrificial system. The truth lies, as he sees, deeper than the superficial distinction between a prophetic or 'spiritual' religion and a religion of materialistic institutionalism. Yet even Dr. Welch misses the real point. The fundamental reason why the prophets, for all their denunciation of the corruption or of the hypocrisy of the cultus, could never have dreamed of its extinction is to be sought in the bifocal character of the Covenant-religion, or, in other words, in its inherent dualism. The importance of this will become more apparent when we deal with post-exilic worship, but it is a factor which must never be left out of account. A unifocal religion, one which 'looks upwards' only, may be able to dispense with an institutional cultus, though if it does so it tends inevitably to individualism. Much of our own religion is, indeed, of this type: its worship is restricted to what Dr. Welch calls the 'cult-act' of purely mental prayer, and it is in continual danger of forgetting the essential meaning of the Christ-life. But the religion of Israel could not faithfully follow this path. It began with a single focus, the 'tabernacling' Presence on earth, and when with the passing of the centuries the second, 'heavenly', focus was added, this did not mean the extinction of the first. On the contrary, so long as Jahweh showed that it was His good pleasure to dwell amongst His People in the Sanctuary which He had chosen for His Name, so long naturally and inevitably the worship offered there must have its

material media. Holy *flesh* (Jer. xi. 15) must meet the Holy God on the plane which He Himself had appointed; and the Code of Deuteronomy is itself sufficient evidence that there need be nothing *materialistic* in the offering of material sacrifices.

Dr. Welch says of the prophets that 'as their knowledge of the scope and the character of God's purpose deepened and clarified, the men began to realize that the native cult, even after it had been purified from pagan emblems, was not adequately fulfilling its end. Israel's working religion, its acts of faith, were being done in honour of Jahweh, but they were failing to supply to the worshippers true thoughts of Him.'[1] But is this really true of the prophets? They denounced vehemently all the sacrificial worship which was being offered in their day; but they did this not because it would have been inadequate even if offered in the right spirit, but because it was offered in an utterly wrong spirit, a spirit of stubborn revolt from the Covenant-Code. Israel knew quite well how it ought to live, and since it deliberately refused to obey the voice of Jahweh, no offering made by it could be acceptable. Void of a lively faith it might carnally and visibly present its peace-offerings, but actually it ate and drank, to its condemnation, the mere sign or sacrament of the Eucharist which it was claiming to celebrate (Article xxix: cf. Jer. vii. 21).

But, it may be asked, even if this was Jeremiah's view of the cultus before the destruction of Jerusalem, did he really look forward to its restoration after the Captivity? Is not his slighting reference to the Ark a clear proof that he conceived the Presence as manifest-

[1] Op. cit., p. 71.

ing Itself henceforth in a purely 'inward and spiritual' manner; and if this is so, did he not at least indirectly teach a new and more 'spiritual' form of worship? The passage about the Ark, which we may consider first, is unfortunately one of those which have long been an object of suspicion,[1] but we may assume for our purpose that it is in substance the work of Jeremiah. Addressed to 'Israel', i.e. the northern tribes, it runs:

Return, O backsliding children, saith Jahweh,
For I am a husband unto you:
And I will take you one of a city, and two of a family,
And I will bring you to Zion:
And I will give you shepherds according to mine heart,
which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding.

And it shall come to pass, when ye be multiplied and increased in the land, in those days, saith Jahweh,
They shall say no more, The Ark of the Covenant of Jahweh,
Neither shall it come to mind:
Neither shall they remember it;
Neither shall they visit it;
Neither shall it be made any more.
(Jer. iii. 14–16)

The reference here to *Zion* as the place to which Jahweh will lead the remnant of Northern Israel may not be authentic, yet it would not be out of keeping with Jeremiah's conception of Jahweh as remaining in His Land and in particular at Jerusalem, while His People are cast out. The whole of chapter xxxii, with its acted parable of the purchasing of the field in Anathoth, is a vivid prediction of Jahweh's purpose

[1] See Peake, op. cit., vol. i, pp. 108–9, for the reasons alleged against its authenticity.

to replant His People in and about the city. Nor is there anything in the least unnatural in the idea that the remnant of the Northern Kingdom would of its own will seek the central Sanctuary, now no longer shut off from it by Jeroboam's sin:

For there shall be a day,
that the watchmen upon the hills of Ephraim shall cry,
Arise ye, and let us go up to Zion
unto Jahweh our God. (Jer. xxxi. 6)

All that Jeremiah is concerned to warn them of is that, when they do go up, they will find no Ark in the 'Oracle': it will have disappeared for ever. But why is this warning uttered, and what does it imply? We can hardly doubt that the Ark, like the visible structure of the Naos, was being treated in Jeremiah's day as guaranteeing the safety of Jerusalem, irrespective of the behaviour of its inhabitants. Though he does not mention it, Jeremiah has doubtless in his mind the memory of the ancient catastrophe in which the palladium of Jahweh had once already been lost to Israel because of its wickedness. Let it learn now that this time there would be no triumphant return to Beth-shemesh. The Ark in which it put its trust would vanish, never to be restored to honour, never even to be replaced. So much seems to be clear, but what does it imply? Is it correct to say that 'the sense of the original oracle of Jeremiah was that when the New Covenant has been instituted, each will have direct and first-hand knowledge of God, so that the Ark which guaranteed and mediated His Presence with the nation will be obsolete'?[1] Surely not. We shall deal with the New Covenant in a moment, but quite

[1] Peake, op. cit., p. 110.

apart from that aspect of the problem it is evident that Jeremiah's words do not imply an essential change in the mode of the 'tabernacling' of Jahweh. To Jeremiah it was the Name, not the Ark, which represented the Presence, and it would never occur to him that the disappearance of a chest of acacia wood would involve the permanent abandonment of the Naos by Jahweh! This is not, and cannot be, his meaning. That Jahweh would once more cause His *Name* to 'tabernacle' in Its Sanctuary must have been assumed by him without argument, for there was at that time no other conceivable alternative. The idea of God's 'tabernacling' *in the hearts of His People* is never dreamt of in the Bible till we find it in the New Testament; and it is *there* because it is the first-fruits of the Atonement 'in Christ'. Jeremiah's prediction about the Ark can therefore have no bearing on this subject: it must be taken exactly as it stands and for what it says. Because Israel has broken the Covenant made at Horeb and because it has profaned with gross and lying boasts the Ark of that Covenant which was once identified with the Presence of Jahweh (and was no doubt thought by some to do so still), the Ark would be taken from it never to return.

It is, in short, not a change in the mode of the 'tabernacling' of Jahweh which Jeremiah predicts, but a change in the hearts of those who will hereafter worship Him:

I will put my law in their inward parts
And in their heart will I write it;
And I will be their God
And they shall be my people;
And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour,
And every man his brother,

Saying, know Jahweh:
For they shall all know me,
From the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith Jahweh,
For I will forgive their iniquity
And their sin will I remember no more.
(Jer. xxxi. 33–4)

These words strike the keynote of all Jeremiah's utterances. He was not charged with any message about the Presence: that was to come later from Ezekiel. *His* 'burden' was to denounce the disobedience of Israel, its refusal to listen to Jahweh's voice as expressed in the written words of the Law; and he complains repeatedly that those who should have taught the People were largely responsible for withholding this knowledge from them. Hence when he speaks of 'Covenant', he does not mean it in the old unilateral sense of an act by which Jahweh binds Israel to Himself and promises to dwell in its midst: he thinks of it as a double-sided contract which can only be maintained if Israel is faithful to the judgements and statutes imposed upon it. Hence again when he predicts a New Covenant, it is the thought of faithful obedience which is naturally foremost in his mind, and he can conceive of no way in which such an obedience would be possible except by the direct action of Jahweh upon the hearts of His People. So he writes of the first 'captivity' under Jeconiah:

I will give them an heart to know me,
that I am Jahweh:
And they shall be my people,
And I will be their God:
For they shall return unto me
with their whole heart. (Jer. xxiv. 7)

So again of the whole people

> I will bring them again unto this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God: and I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever . . . and I will put my fear in their hearts that they shall not depart from me. (Jer. xxxii. 38–9, 40)

The sense of all these passages is the same, and it is exactly paralleled by Ezekiel when he too speaks of Jeconiah's 'captivity':

> I will give them one heart,
> And I will put a new spirit within you;
> And I will take the stony heart out of their flesh,
> And I will give them an heart of flesh:
> That they may walk in my statutes
> And keep my ordinances,
> And do them:
> And they shall be my people,
> And I will be their God. (Ezek. xi. 19–20)

Here, since it is Ezekiel who is prophesying, there can be no question about the meaning. Ezekiel looked forward to the return of the Presence to the Naos in Jerusalem and made elaborate arrangements for the worship to be offered before It. But he knew, quite as well as Jeremiah, that no sacrifice could be acceptable to Jahweh if the hearts of His worshippers remained faithless to His ordinances: there must be the revolutionary moral change in their dispositions before there could be any renewal of the service of the altar.

To sum up, in spite of all that has been said about Jeremiah as the great teacher of 'spiritual religion', we can find in reality no evidence for this assertion, if it means a religion which dispenses with all material

media. Jeremiah, it must be repeated, was not concerned with this question at all. His task was to convince his countrymen of their moral iniquity and to foretell their inevitable doom, if they refused to obey the Law. That done, he had no more to say, except to predict a new covenant based upon a total change of heart, which would be effected by Jahweh Himself. It is at this point that Ezekiel takes up the tale, overlapping Jeremiah, as we have seen, at certain points, but carrying the vision of the New Covenant an important stage farther. It is, in fact, vital that we should study these two prophets together, if we are to gain a complete view of the message revealed to them: when we fail to do this, we are in danger of misinterpreting Jeremiah by reading into his silence an attitude to religion of which he was entirely innocent.

But if Jeremiah did not himself encourage abandonment of belief in the 'tabernacling' Presence, the loss of the Temple inevitably did so. We may observe the beginning of this tendency in the great 'Solomonic' prayer (1 Kings viii. 14–53), of which mention has already been made. The internal evidence of this document shows that it was composed while the Temple was still standing but when a certain number of Jews were already in exile and without prospect of return (viii. 46–53): its author was thus in all probability one of Jeconiah's 'good' captivity. What is noticeable here is the writer's ambiguous use of the word 'house' which enables him to slide almost imperceptibly from the Naos to the Hieron. The former of these, it will be remembered, was the Temple proper, the 'house' or dwelling-place of Jahweh, and this is the meaning in verses 17–20 of the 'house' which has been built 'for

the Name'. But now this last expression has been entirely evacuated of its old 'tabernacling' associations: it means no more than that Jahweh, whose dwelling-place is in 'heaven', has chosen the Temple as the place on earth 'towards which' Israel is to pray and 'towards which' His eyes will be open day and night. Obviously the Naos has ceased here to be of any vital importance, and we find accordingly that in verse 33 the 'house' has become the Hieron, *in which* Israel confesses the Name, and prays and makes supplication. But we have still to go one step farther. So little distinguishable in holiness has this 'house' now become that it is associated (verse 48) both with the land which Jahweh has given to the fathers and with the city which He had chosen as the sacred focus towards which the captive exiles are to direct their prayers!

This tendency to exalt the Hieron at the expense of the Naos and at the same time to spread its holiness over Jerusalem is found to a marked degree in the later chapters of Isaiah (xl–lxvi). The references to the exaltation of Zion are so numerous and familiar that there is no need to quote them, but one or two passages about the Temple deserve attention. Thus, in lvi. 7 the emphasis on the Hieron is very clear:

> Even them (the strangers) will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer;
> Their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar:
> For mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all peoples.

So again, in lxiv. 10–11:

> Zion is become a wilderness,
> Jerusalem a desolation.

Our holy and our beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee, is burned with fire.

Nor is there any doubt that Jahweh's dwelling-place is thought of as 'heaven'. It is true that in one passage He is described as 'tabernacling' in the 'high and holy place' (lvii. 15), but as this 'tabernacling' is ascribed to 'eternity', it is difficult to believe that it refers to the Naos. On the other hand, we have the great appeal of lxiii. 7–19, in which after asking where is He who once delivered Israel, the writer cries:

Look down from heaven,
And behold from the habitation of thy holiness and of thy glory.
Where is thy zeal and thy mighty acts? . . .
Return for thy servants' sake,
the tribes of thine inheritance.
Thy holy people possessed it but a little while:
Our adversaries have trodden down thy sanctuary.

Jahweh is in 'heaven', that is taken for granted. He has a 'Sanctuary' on earth but it is no more than a holy place where sacrifices can be offered, and prayers uttered in His Name:

Thus saith Jahweh,
The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool:
What manner of house will ye build unto me?
And what place shall be my rest?
For all these things hath mine hand made,
And so all these things came to be, saith Jahweh.
(Isa. lxvi. 1–2*a*)

Only one slight concession can be made, so that there may be some link, however tenuous, between the essential Being of Jahweh and His ancient dwelling-place; and this is found in the conception that the

Sanctuary itself (rather than the whole earth as in the previous passage) is 'the place of His feet'. This idea (Isa. lx. 13), which is echoed in Ps. xcix. 5 and Ps. cxxxii. 7, may be regarded as the lowest point which the belief in the 'tabernacling' Presence could attain, short of absolute extinction. Indeed, so far as 'tabernacling' is concerned, it has already been extinguished; we are left rather with a picturesque image of Jahweh's condescension to the place where He is worshipped on earth.

All this, it must be repeated, is most 'natural'. When a religion has advanced beyond the naïve thought of a tribal or territorial god, its gaze is lifted perforce from earth to heaven. This is not to say that it becomes less naïve in the process: it merely means that the widening horizon of religious thought and aspiration inevitably seeks an imagery which is less obviously inadequate. God is felt to be infinitely exalted in power and holiness: therefore He is pictured as inhabiting the infinite spaces which overarch the earth. So strong indeed is this tendency of human thought, when it has passed a certain stage in its evolution, that our Lord Himself accepted it with all its evident defects: He was 'carried up into heaven'. We are therefore fully entitled to make use of this symbolism ourselves; and, as the Ascension shows, we *must* make use of it on certain appropriate occasions. But we must not lose sight of the fact that it does not represent the complete picture of Revealed Religion. This has its 'unnatural' as well as its 'natural' side, and it is the 'unnatural' which, however much it is threatened with expulsion, 'recurs' nevertheless with unfailing persistence. It is such a 'recurrence' which we witness in the visions and prophecies of Ezekiel.

Chapter V

EZEKIEL

A GOOD deal of controversy has arisen in recent years over the authorship of the prophecies which bear the name of Ezekiel, and it is therefore unfortunately necessary to say a word about the critical problem. When Dr. Driver wrote his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, he could maintain that such a problem simply did not exist: 'the whole from beginning to end bears unmistakably the stamp of a single mind.' This view has been seriously challenged by a number of scholars and even Dr. Battersby Harford, who dissents from their more extreme conclusions, believes that there were two main authors, and that the book has also received additions by later hands. In this 'remarkable partnership', one writer was a prophet living in or near Jerusalem during the last days of the Southern Kingdom, while the other is pictured as a 'young disciple of the older man' who belonged to the period of the Captivity and dwelt in Babylonia. 'But while we can with much probability assign certain portions of the Book to one or other of these two prophetic souls, yet the outstanding wonder of this Book of composite authorship is the unity of the spiritual message which it presents. The two men are essentially one at heart, though each has his own method of expressing the message.'[1]

In view of this definitely modest conclusion, of the remarkable symmetry of the book as a whole and of the frequent recurrence of certain characteristic

[1] Battersby Harford, *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel*, 1935, pp. 71–3.

phrases, it may well be asked whether, after all, there is any real necessity for assuming a dual authorship. There is in fact only one serious problem to be faced, and that is whether a man living in Babylonia could witness scenes actually taking place in the courts of the Temple at Jerusalem. If he could *not*, then the passages in which such scenes are described must either be imaginary or have been composed in Palestine. But the writer obviously *claims* that he saw them in trance; he says that the spirit lifted him up between earth and heaven and brought him 'in the visions of God to Jerusalem' (viii. 3). Why should he think it necessary to say this, if he were himself living there? Furthermore, he speaks as one who is quite evidently *not* living there. Take for example his acted-parable of exile (xii. 1–12). This is assigned by Dr. Battersby Harford to his first author, the man who lived 'in or near Jerusalem'. But the only reason for supposing this is that it is not at first sight clear why a man resident among the Babylonian exiles should 'act' a prophecy indicating exile for people resident in Palestine. What, however, does the prophet actually *say*?

> Thus saith the Lord Jahweh,
> This burden concerneth the prince in Jerusalem
> And all the house of Israel among whom they are.
> Say, I am your sign:
> Like as I have done,
> So shall it be done unto them:
> They shall go into exile, into captivity
> And the prince that is among them shall bear upon his shoulder in the dark,
> And shall go forth. . . . (xii. 10–12)

This parable, in other words, is laid upon the prophet

as a sign which is to be displayed to his own audience ('your sign') in Babylonia but which that audience is to understand as referring to the prince and people *in Palestine* ('done unto *them*'). Nothing surely could be simpler or clearer. In the previous chapter Ezekiel has told his fellow-exiles how their own brethren, 'the inhabitants of Jerusalem', have been saying of them 'get you far from Jahweh: unto us is this land given for a possession'. They were assuming, that is, that they themselves would never be carried into captivity and were laying arrogant claim to the property of Ezekiel's fellow-exiles. But this (he goes on) is what Jahweh says to *them* about *you*:

> Whereas I have removed them far off among the nations,
> And whereas I have scattered them among the countries,
> Yet will I be to them a sanctuary for a little while
> In the countries where they are come. (xi. 16)

Then he turns to his own audience directly:

> Thus saith the Lord Jahweh:
> I will gather you from the peoples
> And assemble you out of the countries . . .
> And I will give you the land of Israel. . . .
> (xi. 17)

Then the message changes into the third person again:

> And they shall come thither . . .
> And I will give them one heart, &c. (xi. 18 f.)

The only difficulty here, and it is a very small one, is that the prophet *receives* this message when he has been brought in trance to the courts of the Temple, but that he does not *deliver* it till he 'returns' to his fellow-exiles in Babylonia. Hence the change from the third to the second person and back again. At one moment he

thinks of Jahweh's message as being delivered by him directly to the people at whom it is *aimed*, i.e. to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, at another as being spoken to those to whom it *refers*, i.e. to his own companions in captivity. Actually, however, he has one audience and one only. His mission is to his fellow-exiles, and his task, or rather the first part of it, is to convince them that they must cherish no hope of returning to Jerusalem till after its destruction and the scattering of its remaining inhabitants. To do this he has to build up his picture by stages. He has to show first that Jerusalem will be besieged and smitten with the sword: this is done by the 'parable' of the tile on which the city is 'pourtrayed' (iv. 1; v. 2). But why should the Holy City suffer such a fate? Because of the 'abominations' which have defiled not only the 'mountains of Israel' (vi) and the 'four corners of the land' (vii) but the very courts of Jahweh's own Sanctuary (viii). But how does the prophet know what is taking place there? The answer is that he has witnessed these things with his own eyes in 'the visions of God', and that at the very moment of his pronouncing the Divine curse (even though none could hear it) Pelatiah, one of the chief ring-leaders, dropped down dead. Then let not his fellow-captives delude themselves. Their own prophets in Babylonia, as well as those still in Jerusalem, are holding forth hopes of a speedy return from exile for those who have been carried away and declaring loudly that Jerusalem itself will henceforth know only peace (xiii; cf. Jer. xxix). But it is a lie. The bloody city will go down in bloodshed, its profaned Sanctuary will be made desolate, and its prince and all its inhabitants will be dispersed among the nations (xii).

Such in broad outline is Ezekiel's message. If we reject the possibility of trance clairvoyance, we must dismiss it as fictitious, but in itself it is complicated for us modern readers only if we misunderstand its significance and fail to take into account the Divine 'virtue' with which a prophetic utterance was believed to be charged. When Ezekiel pronounces the sentence of Jahweh's vengeance upon the 'mountains of Israel' or upon Jerusalem and its inhabitants, this does not mean that he must at this moment be living in Palestine or that the people who hear his utterances are doing so. He prophesies as Jahweh's mouthpiece against Jahweh's Land, and those who acknowledge his authority will know that what he says must come to pass, and will shape their ways accordingly: for the rest, the message must be uttered, 'whether they hear or whether they forbear'. Actually, as Ezekiel himself repeatedly tells us, he had to face an uphill task. The people to whom he spoke (and who seem to have included some of the Captivity from the Northern Kingdom) were a 'rebellious house' even in exile. That is no doubt why the first half of his book is so full of the 'adulteries' of Israel and Judah. Yet these, though they bulk so largely, did not constitute, in reality, the heart of his message: for that we have to turn to his visions of the 'tabernacling' Presence.

For Ezekiel had a second and harder task. He had not merely to persuade his companions that in spite of all the boasts about its sacrosanctity Jerusalem must fall and its Holy Temple be violated: he must make them understand also the invisible and spiritual disaster of which this catastrophe was only the outward sign. We are reminded here forcibly of our Lord's own

method of teaching spiritual truths about Himself through external signs. In particular we may recall the healing of the palsied man in Capernaum (Mark ii. 1–12 and parallels), where the bodily cure is used to give assurance of the Son of Man's authority to forgive sins. So, in much the same way, Ezekiel used the portent of the destruction of Jerusalem to convince his hearers of that other part of his message of which no tangible proof or ocular evidence could be given, namely that Jahweh had withdrawn His Presence from the Sanctuary which the sins of Israel had so grossly polluted.

We come now to the visions of the Presence themselves. To understand them in their entirety would, of course, be impossible, for they are an attempt to describe in human language a mystery which defies description. Yet there are certain points about them which are sufficiently clear though they are apt to be overshadowed by the obscurity which enfolds them. The first is that these are visions of the '*tabernacling*' *Presence* and must not be confused with the appearance described by Isaiah. Isaiah saw Jahweh so 'high and lifted up' that only His skirts filled the Temple: of the Ark-throne and its Cherubim there is no mention, only six-winged 'Seraphim' are named, and these stand 'above Him'. The vision granted to Ezekiel is something entirely different from this. What he sees is 'the likeness of a throne' standing above 'the likeness of a firmament' which is stretched out over the heads of four four-headed and four-winged Cherubim, while above the firmament he hears a Voice and on the throne he beholds 'a likeness as the appearance of a man'. With the exception of this last figure the details of this description are unmistakable. The throne

above the Cherubim had only one place in the religious thought of Israel, and that place was the Holy of Holies. So it is said (Num. vii. 89) that 'when Moses went into the tent of meeting to speak with him, then he heard the Voice speaking unto him from above the mercy-seat that was upon the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim'.

When therefore Ezekiel sees this appearance coming out of the north[1] in its 'great cloud with a fire flashing continually', he knows at once what it is, and he expects his readers to know: 'This was the appearance of the likeness of the Glory of Jahweh'. It is the Presence which has never ceased to 'tabernacle' in cloud and thick darkness in the midst of Israel; which has refused always to be thought of as fettered within a particular shrine of wood and stone but has always 'walked with all the children of Israel' (2 Sam. vii. 7), even while His Sanctuary remained the visible focus of their worship. So now this Presence seeks out His prophet in Babylonia even while the Temple is still His 'House', and so too He promises (if this is the meaning of an obscure passage) that, when the Temple has been left desolate and void, He will be Himself a Sanctuary for a 'little while' to those of His People who remain faithful to Him in captivity. Meanwhile the prophet is commanded to witness the outpouring of the Divine wrath upon the polluted city and the final departure of the Glory. The vision is full of obscurities, but seems to be divided into three stages. In

[1] This point of the compass is presumably mentioned because the prophet thinks of Jerusalem as being to the north of his place of exile. It can certainly have no reference to the mountain of God in Ezek. xxviii. 14, for the Glory is closely connected in these prophecies with the Naos at Jerusalem.

the first the Glory leaves the Holy of Holies and moves to the threshold of the Naos (ix. 3 repeated in x. 4):

> And the glory of Jahweh mounted up from the cherub (Gk. "cherubim") above the threshold of the house; and the house was filled with the cloud, and the court was full of the brightness of the glory of Jahweh. And the sound of the wings of the cherubim was heard even to the outer court, as the voice of El Shaddai when he speaketh. (x. 4–5)

At this point the destroyers are sent forth through the city. Then the Glory moves still farther to the east till He stands over the outer wall of the Hieron:

> And the glory of Jahweh went forth from over the threshold of the house, and stood over the cherubim, and the cherubim lifted up their wings and mounted up from the earth in my sight . . . and they stood at the door of the east gate of Jahweh's house; and the glory of the God of Israel was over them above. (x. 18–19)

Here the last sentence of judgement is pronounced upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and Ezekiel is given his message of hope to his fellow-exiles, ending with the promise of a new heart and a new Covenant ('They shall be my people and I will be their God'). After this comes the final departure when the Glory withdraws altogether from the city and stands over the Mount of Olives:

> Then did the cherubim lift up their wings, and the wheels were beside them; and the glory of the God of Israel was over them above. And the glory of Jahweh went up from the midst of the city, and stood upon the mountain which is on the east side of the city. (xi. 22–3)

This is the end, and though no further word is spoken

it is as if a Voice which is to be heard no more for centuries has uttered its sad farewell:

> O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate: and I say unto you, ye shall not see me until ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of Jahweh.

There are two further points about these visions which have still to be mentioned. Twice we hear it charged against the idolatrous worshippers in the Temple, that they say 'Jahweh seeth us not; Jahweh hath forsaken the Land' (viii. 12; ix. 9). Now there was one obvious answer which could be made to such a blasphemy, and we can put it fitly in the very words used in a similar connexion by Jeremiah:

> Am I a God at hand, saith Jahweh,
> And not a God afar off?
> Can any hide himself in secret places that I
> shall not see him? saith Jahweh.
> Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith Jahweh.
> (Jer. xxiii. 23–4)

This is the answer of 'natural' religion, the answer which is voiced so exquisitely by the Psalmist:

> Whither shall I go from thy spirit?
> Or whither shall I flee from thy Presence?
> If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there:
> If I make my bed in Sheol, behold thou art there.
> If I take the wings of the morning
> And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea:
> Even there shall thy hand lead me,
> And thy right hand shall hold me. . . .
> (Ps. cxxxix. 7–10)

But it is not the answer given in the Book of Ezekiel. What is suggested here is that because the Presence in the Naos was invisible, men had begun to deny that It was there at all. Yet all the while, did they but know it, the Glory was near at hand, watching the pollution of His courts; and it was because of their iniquities not of His own will that He must in the end 'forsake' them:

> And he said unto me, Son of man, seest thou what they do? even the great abominations that the house of Israel do commit here, that I should go far off from my sanctuary? (viii. 6)

It is perhaps easy to regard this answer as a much cruder and more primitive one than that of Jeremiah and the Psalmist, yet there is nothing otherwise crude or primitive in the religious outlook of Ezekiel. We must look deeper for an explanation, and the first thing to be considered is the psychological factor. Ezekiel, like Jeremiah, was a priest; but while Jeremiah, if he was a descendant of the banished Abiathar, may never actually have officiated in the Temple, Ezekiel seems to have been a member of the Zadokite priesthood in whose hands the Covenant-worship had been for centuries. For him the 'tabernacling' Presence was not so much a doctrine as an intimate and living reality, and we can learn from what is one of the most poignant passages in the Bible with how passionate a devotion he regarded Its Sanctuary:

> Also the word of Jahweh came unto me, saying,
> Son of man, behold I take away from thee the desire of thine eyes with a stroke:
> Yet neither shalt thou mourn nor weep,
> Neither shall thy tears run down. . . .

So I spake unto the people in the morning, and at even my wife died: and I did in the morning as I was commanded. And the people said unto me, Wilt thou not tell us what these things are to us, that thou doest so? Then I said unto them, The word of Jahweh came unto me, saying, Speak unto the house of Israel,

Thus saith the Lord Jahweh:
Behold, I will profane my sanctuary,
The pride of your power
The desire of your eyes,
And the pity of your soul. . . .
And ye shall do as I have done:
Ye shall not cover your lips . . .
Ye shall not mourn nor weep. . . .
Thus shall Ezekiel be unto you a sign.

(xxiv. 15–24)

To such a man the vision of Jahweh could come naturally in one way only; yet the fact that it came *repeatedly* to Ezekiel must be allowed its own significance. We have, moreover, to ask *why* such a man should have been chosen at this juncture to proclaim the destruction of Jerusalem when, if this were all the context of his message, it might have been delivered without any of this (apparently) archaic symbolism. It is regrettable that Christians so often overlook this point. They welcome the utterances of a man like Jeremiah, because they breathe a spirit of religious aspiration which is entirely congenial to the modern religious mind; and having thus unconsciously set a standard of their own by which prophecy is to be judged, they find themselves seriously embarrassed when they come to cope with Ezekiel. But the Bible is a vehicle of Revelation, and it is not open to a believer to select from it only such passages as suit his

personal taste: he has to learn from it what God has said through His messengers 'by divers portions and in divers manners.' This is where a purely psychological, like a purely literary, criticism finds its limit. We are really no further forward when we have accounted psychologically for the particular mental imagery with which Ezekiel clothes his visions; and if we are inclined to dismiss it as unworthy and even fantastic, we have actually taken a step backward. The real question is, do these visions correspond to an invisible Reality, which Ezekiel has been chosen to reveal? And if so, what is this Reality?

When we go back to these visions and examine them still more closely, we notice a third and most remarkable feature: the Glory of Jahweh is revealed as 'a likeness as the appearance of a man'. What does this imply? It is tempting to regard it at first as a daring flight of anthropomorphism, but the very carefulness of the language forbids this assumption. It would be more accurate to describe it as an attempt to speak of the Presence in terms of '*Naomorphism*', of Sanctuary-symbolism. Here, in fact, the dualism of Covenant-theology is emphasized in its most drastic form. The Glory of Jahweh is at once Jahweh and yet not Jahweh. He speaks (we are forced to say He not It) with a Voice which men can hear and understand, not 'as the voice of El Shaddai when he speaketh' (x. 5). And, as He speaks, so He 'tabernacles', submitting Himself to the limitations of human existence, not as 'a man' but in the 'likeness of man's appearance'. This point is most strikingly brought out in the prophetic description of the entry of the Presence into the new Naos which will one day be His House (xliii. 1–7):

Afterwards he brought me to the gate, even the gate that looketh toward the east: and behold, the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the east: and his voice was like the sound of many waters: and the earth shined with his glory. . . .

And the glory of Jahweh came into the house by the way of the gate whose prospect is toward the east. And the spirit took me up, and brought me into the inner court; and behold, the glory of Jahweh filled the house.

And I heard one speaking unto me out of the house; and a man stood by me. And he said unto me,

Son of man, this is the place of my throne,
And the place of the soles of my feet,
Where I will tabernacle in the midst of the children of Israel for ever.

Here the stages of self-limitation are clearly marked. At His first appearance the Glory is revealed in His full unearthly majesty, yet when He reaches the Temple, He enters in by one of the gates, an act which has its own mysterious significance:

Then he brought me back the way of the outer gate of the sanctuary, which looketh toward the east; and it was shut. And Jahweh said unto me, This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, neither shall any man enter in by it, for Jahweh, the God of Israel, hath entered in by it; therefore it shall be shut. (xliv. 1–2)

Then, once the Glory has filled the Naos, He speaks out of it to the prophet as 'a man', declaring that from henceforth He will be enthroned within it for ever. It will be noticed that here too the Naos is described as the place of Jahweh's feet, but the meaning of this expression is quite different from that which we found at the end of the preceding chapter. To use a convenient term once again, Ezekiel is speaking in the

language of strict Naomorphism: he is saying of the Naos what St. Paul, thinking perhaps of this passage, was to say later of Christ: 'In [it] dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.'

Are we to hold Ezekiel alone responsible for this reaffirmation of the reality of the 'tabernacling' Presence? Is this simply the psychological reaction of a devoted priest to the growing tendency of thought which we have already studied; the tendency which by seeking Jahweh in 'heaven' inevitably sapped men's belief in His earthly dwelling-place? That is, of course, one possibility. But there is another which is not lightly to be rejected, and which serious believers in Inspiration will naturally consider first. This starts from the same point, namely that a one-sided emphasis on the 'heavenly' view of God must tend of necessity to depreciate the darker mystery of His 'tabernacling' among His People. But what if this mystery concealed a truth which it was vital to preserve? What if, instead of being a mere primitive archaism which might well be allowed to become obsolete, it held in its depths the seed of a hope which was one day to blossom and bear fruit a thousandfold more precious? Then surely our ideas about this prophet must undergo a thorough re-ordering. We shall be tempted no longer to see him as the honest but untimely champion of a reactionary cause: rather he will appear as a man chosen indeed for his own special gifts and profession because the message which he was to deliver must be couched in these terms and in none other. He must recall his countrymen to the belief which they were already in danger of abandoning and which with the destruction of the Temple must otherwise inevitably

perish. He must make them understand that the central mystery of the Covenant remained unaltered. In this sense, indeed, there was no 'new' Covenant to come. What Ezekiel predicted was both a renewal and a transfiguration of the ancient bond, which had been shattered by Israel's sin but would be restored by Jahweh's forgiveness. This involved certainly on the side of Israel the kind of renewal which Jeremiah had foretold:

I will sprinkle clean water upon you,
And ye shall be clean:
From all your filthiness, and from all your idols,
Will I cleanse you.
A new heart also will I give you,
And a new spirit will I put within you:
And I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh,
And I will give you an heart of flesh.
And I will put my spirit within you,
And cause you to walk in my statutes . . .
And ye shall be my people
And I will be your God. (Ezek. xxxvi. 25–8)

But this, for Ezekiel, was not the essence of the Covenant: it was simply the necessary preparation of Israel so that it might be fit to enjoy it. The essence of the Covenant was the dwelling of Jahweh amidst His People, the act by which He would sanctify them for ever:

Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them:
It shall be an everlasting covenant with them:
And I will place them, and multiply them,
And will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore.
My tabernacle also shall be with them;

And I will be their God,
And they shall be my people.
And the nations shall know that I Jahweh do sanctify Israel,
When my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore. (xxxvii. 26–8)

This utterance is the crown of Ezekiel's prophetic mission. Here for the first time in the history of Israel we meet with a conception which is to prove of universal and inexhaustible significance, the conception of 'At-one-ment'. This term is not, of course, actually used by the prophet, nor indeed is it used at all in the Bible in this particular sense, but we shall find it of the greatest possible value in describing that consummation which Ezekiel foreshadows, the Communion in perfect holiness between the People and the Presence. What that ideal Communion meant to the old Israel from his day onwards we shall consider more fully in the following chapter: for the moment it must be enough to describe it in broad outline and to give some general idea of its potential significance.

We note first that this 'At-one-ment' is a collective one. This was an idea which no Israelite would have thought of challenging, and here, in spite of their 'individualist' teaching, Jeremiah and Ezekiel are at one. Both these prophets predict a new and better Covenant-relation, and a 'Covenant' necessarily implies a People. It was as an Israelite, not as in his own right, that a man had personal relations with his God, and it would be idle to look in the Old Testament for anything that we ourselves would call 'individualism'. But, this being so, it follows that this conception of At-one-ment both required, and lent itself to, a clear-cut and concrete definition. Focused on the Presence

within the Naos, it drew the Holy People to its Holy One through an elaborately ordered system of communal purification and communal worship. This explains the extraordinary detail in which Ezekiel describes his vision of the Temple and its ordinances, a feature which is still more prominent in the Priestly Code. We shall ask later how far it is right to call such minutiae 'unspiritual', a charge which is so often brought against them.

A second point which may be briefly noticed here is the relation between the 'purification' and the 'worship' already alluded to. The former of these, which includes what was called 'expiation' (Hebrew *kippēr*, E.V. Atonement), was an indispensable preliminary to the latter, and in this sense was all-important. Ezekiel indeed predicts an initial act of purification (see above) which will be accomplished upon Israel by Jahweh Himself, before it is allowed to come near Him in His new Temple; thereafter periodical rites of purification are ordained (including the sin-, and guilt-, offerings) so that the People may be preserved in a state of perfect holiness. Here again we may postpone a detailed discussion of this conception till we examine the fuller prescriptions of the Priestly Code, but it is important to observe that, for all the emphasis placed upon it, 'purification' was in reality no more than a means to an end. That end, as we have seen, was the uninhibited Communion between Jahweh and His People; a Communion which found its outward expression in eucharistic offerings, especially those of the great festivals, and an unbroken round of prayer and praise. This was to be the crown and heart of the new transfigured Covenant-relations, and it was for this that

Ezekiel and his successors of the Priestly School planned their great structure of hierarchical rites and ceremonies.

Lastly we may observe what is perhaps the most remarkable feature of these later prophecies of Ezekiel, namely the combination of a scrupulous minuteness of description with visions in which the note of mystery entirely predominates. We have already indicated why the first of these was necessary. It represented the outward and visible aspect of the coming At-one-ment; and no care could be too great, no detail too trivial, if the worship offered by Israel was to be worthy of acceptance. But this was only one side, and that the human side, of the mystery, and it is placed by Ezekiel significantly between two visions which effectively counterbalance it. 'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing', this might almost be called the lesson of the Valley of Dry Bones (xxxvii); and it is answered by the still more wonderful vision of the Living Waters flowing from the Naos to bring sweetness and healing to the barren places of the earth (xlvii). This is the Divine side of the At-one-ment, the side of which Israel, worshipping in its Hieron, needs constantly to be reminded. It is Jahweh who does all, and has done all, for His People. It is He who leads them, as their Shepherd, to their own pastures: it is He who, when they count themselves as dead, pours out His quickening Spirit upon them and gives them a new life. And He does this, not so much for their sake, but for the sake of His Holy Name which has been profaned among the nations. Let them remember that when they are tempted to think of themselves as the sole object of His Love; for they will find that even

while He 'tabernacles' amongst them, His Saving Power will not be confined within walls of stone:

East the forefront of habitations holy
Gleamed to Engedi, shone to Eneglaim;
Softly thereout and from thereunder slowly
Wandered the waters, and delayed, and came.

Then the great stream, which having seen He showeth,
Hid from the wise but manifest to Him,
Flowed and arose, as when Euphrates floweth,
Rose from the ankles till a man might swim.

Even with so soft a surge and an increasing,
Drunk of the sand and thwarted of the clod,
Stilled and astir and checked and never-ceasing
Spreadeth the great wave of the grace of God[1] . . .

[1] F. W. H. Myers, *Saint Paul.*

Chapter VI

FAITH AND WORSHIP AFTER THE EXILE

WHY was the sacrificial system of the old Temple worship not merely restored but elaborated after the Exile? This question must always perplex those who hold that, through Jeremiah's prophecies and the destruction of Jerusalem which followed them, Israel was being led providentially towards a purer, more 'spiritual' conception of worship. If this were true, then we must indeed admit that a great opportunity was lost. In exile the Jews had been compelled to seek a new path of approach to God. Sorrow for sin could only be expressed then in prayer and fasting and the sacrifice of a broken and a contrite heart, while psalms and hymns must take the place of the old oblations through which Israel had once offered its praise and thanksgiving and adoration. But was not this path the right one? Was it not the path which, once the lesson had been learned, must endear itself to the People of God above, and to the exclusion of, all others? To return after this to the gross and cumbrous system of material sacrifices, was not this in truth a most woeful declension?

We have already anticipated the answer to these questions, but may now make it plainer. The answer is, in effect, that the Jews had no choice about the matter at all. Even if for a moment their belief in the 'tabernacling' Presence was shaken by the fall of Jerusalem and the loss of the Temple, it was at once reinvigorated by the powerful influence of Ezekiel. More than this, as the span of seventy years of

dereliction predicted by Jeremiah neared its end, new prophetic voices took up the same message. So Haggai summoned his countrymen to rebuild the House of Jahweh, because He was soon to return to it:

> For thus saith Jahweh Sabaoth:
> Yet once more, it is a little while,
> And I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land;
> And I will shake all nations,
> And the desire of all nations shall come,
> And I will fill this house with glory,
> saith Jahweh Sabaoth. (Hag. ii. 6–7)

So too Zechariah:

> Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion:
> For, lo, I come, and I will tabernacle in the midst of thee,
> Saith Jahweh
> And many nations shall join themselves to Jahweh in that day,
> And shall be my people:
> And I will tabernacle in the midst of thee. . . .
> (Zech. ii. 10–11)

And again:

> Thus saith Jahweh:
> I will return unto Zion,
> And will tabernacle in the midst of Jerusalem:
> And Jerusalem shall be called the city of truth;
> And the mountain of Jahweh Sabaoth the holy mountain. . . . (Zech. viii. 3)

> Thus saith Jahweh Sabaoth:
> It shall yet come to pass, that there shall come peoples and the inhabitants of many cities: and the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to intreat the favour of Jahweh, and to seek Jahweh Sabaoth: I will go also.

Yea, many peoples and strong nations shall come to seek Jahweh Sabaoth in Jerusalem,
And to intreat the favour of Jahweh.
(Zech. viii. 20–2)

So Joel, partly quoting from Amos:

Jahweh shall roar from Zion,
And utter his voice from Jerusalem;
And the heavens and the earth shall shake:
But Jahweh will be a refuge unto his people,
And a strong hold to the children of Israel.

So shall ye know that I am Jahweh your God
Tabernacling in Zion my holy mountain:
Then shall Jerusalem be holy,
And there shall no strangers pass through her any more.
And it shall come to pass in that day,
That the mountains shall drop down sweet wine,
And the hills shall flow with milk,
And all the brooks of Judah shall flow with waters;
And a fountain shall come forth of the house of Jahweh,
And shall water the valley of Shittim. . . .
And I will cleanse their blood that I have not cleansed:
For Jahweh tabernacleth in Zion.
(Joel iii. 16–21)

The reference here to the 'fountain' which will flow from the Naos of Jahweh seems to be an intentional echo of Ezekiel's vision of the Living Waters. We find this feature again in one of the late prophecies included in the Book of Zechariah (xiv. 8; cf. xiii. 1), and it seems also to be implied in a short post-exilic fragment in Isaiah:

Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation.
And in that day shall ye say,
Give thanks unto Jahweh,

Proclaim His Name,
Declare his doings among the peoples,
Make mention that his Name is exalted. . . .
Cry aloud and shout,
Thou inhabitant of Zion:
For great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee.
(Isa. xii. 3–6).

It has been suggested that this constant allusion to Jahweh as 'the fountain of Living Waters' (Jer. ii. 13) was derived from the thought of the great cisterns which lay under the Temple area. This, however, is impossible, as the distinction made by Jeremiah clearly shows: only spring-water could be described as 'living', in opposition to the 'dead' water collected and stored in cisterns. It is more probable that the reference is to the belief that the sacred rock on which the Naos stood was the Navel of the Earth, under which were imprisoned the living waters of the abyss, to be withheld or released at Jahweh's good pleasure (cf. Ps. xxxiii. 7). This, in fact, seems to have been the significance of the water-ritual which took place during the Feast of Tabernacles, when a pitcher of water drawn from the spring of Siloam was solemnly brought into the Temple area and emptied into a subterranean channel leading to the Kidron. By this symbolic act Jahweh was entreated to renew the spring-water of His Land during the coming year, so that His People might not die of thirst.[1] This rite has all the appearance of great antiquity, but the fact that in post-exilic times it included the recitation of Isa. xii. 3 shows that it was regarded by them as largely figurative; and we can hardly doubt that this was due to the influence of Ezekiel. Thanks to him and

[1] This is certainly the meaning given to it in John vii. 37–8.

to his successors the old semi-magical symbolism was lifted to a point where it could adumbrate the mystery of a new life-giving force which the 'tabernacling' Presence was one day to pour out of His Naos upon thirsting humanity.

This thought of Zion as the centre of the whole earth, not merely physically but spiritually, because of the glorious Presence in its midst, may be illustrated by a final quotation, part of which is found among the prophecies both of Isaiah and of Micah:

But in the latter days it shall come to pass,
That the mountain of Jahweh's house shall be established
at the head of the mountains,
And it shall be exalted above the hills;
And peoples shall flow unto it.
And many nations shall go and say,
Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jahweh
and to the house of the God of Jacob;
And he will teach us of his ways,
And we will walk in his paths:
For out of Zion shall go forth the law,
And the word of Jahweh from Jerusalem . . .

In that day, saith Jahweh,
Will I assemble her that halteth,
And I will gather her that is driven away
And her that I have afflicted;
And I will make her that halted a remnant
And her that was cast far off a strong nation:
And Jahweh shall reign over them in Mount Zion
From henceforth even for ever.
(Mic. iv. 1–2, 6–7; Isa. ii. 2–3)

For the post-exilic Jew, then, the position was quite clear. The unanimous testimony of his prophets left

no doubt that the 'tabernacling' of the Presence was once again to be localized in Jerusalem; and, this being so, two corollaries necessarily followed. In the first place the Naos itself must obviously be rebuilt. There was now no Ark to place within the Holy of Holies, which from this time onwards was destitute of any material symbol;[1] and it is perhaps for this reason that the 'Oracle' in the Second Temple was shut off by a Veil (or rather a double Veil) instead of the more solid wooden (?) partition which had been previously used, and which was actually anticipated in the vision of Ezekiel (Ezek. xli. 23–4). Indeed, in this respect, the disappearance of the Ark was a gain rather than a loss, for it allowed attention to be concentrated entirely on the immaterial 'Glory', a form of the Presence which it was more suitable to 'screen' from profane eyes than to regard as 'housed' within a special shrine of Its own. At the same time this symbolism of the Veil carried the thoughts back behind Solomon's Temple to the simple tent which it was thought to have replaced; so that, while the Naos was still of necessity a fixed building of stone, it could also stir imagination with memories of the old mobile 'tabernacle'.

But if the Naos was to be rebuilt, it followed naturally in the second place that the Hieron must be rebuilt also; and this involved the restoration of the whole sacrificial system. At first sight this conclusion may not be as obvious as it really is. It may be objected that because the Naos must naturally be surrounded by courts in which Israel could worship, it did not at all follow that these must be provided with the old altar for burnt-offerings and all the other paraphernalia of

[1] A stone in the floor marked the spot where the Ark once stood.

material sacrifice. If the Hieron could be called a 'house of prayer', could not the Jews have used it for that, and for that only? Could they not have done what they did later in their synagogue worship and offered the 'unbloody sacrifice' of their hearts and voices? The argument is plausible, so much so indeed that a Presbyterian scholar has found it possible to contrast the 'resplendent ritual of the Temple' with the 'simple and edifying worship of the synagogue', and to claim that 'for the devout Jew the Temple and its ritual were no longer a necessity'.[1] 'And here', he proceeds, 'let it be noted as a fact of cardinal importance, that the first Christian gatherings for worship on Sundays were, as regards their arrangements generally, modelled upon the synagogue. Whatever may be the case with respect to the Roman and Anglican Churches, our Presbyterian worship is moulded not after the Temple ritual, but upon the service of the synagogue.'[2]

But the case is not so simple as this. Such a depreciatory estimate of the Temple worship comes, indeed, strangely from one who believes in the Inspiration of Holy Scripture and in the Divine guidance of the Chosen People; and this unnatural conjunction shows how necessary it is to take seriously those parts of the Bible which are uncongenial to our own way of thinking. The moral here is obvious. Before we attempt to pass any kind of judgement on the spiritual value of the Temple ritual, we must ask ourselves what sort of worship would be most evidently congruous with a fervent belief in the localized 'tabernacling'

[1] W. Fairweather, *The Background of the Gospels*, 1911, pp. 36 and 27.
[2] Ib., p. 27.

Presence. It is just this effort to put ourselves in the place of the post-exilic Jews which modern Christians, and especially Protestants, so rarely feel called upon to make. Yet a little reflection ought to show that it is the only reasonable way, if we are ever to understand large sections of the Old Testament, such as those which emanate from the so-called Priestly School.

These 'Priestly' writers had, in fact, a most formidable problem to solve: they had to reconcile a fully developed belief in the Holiness of a transcendent God with the ineluctable doctrine of His 'tabernacling' Presence within the Naos. How were they to do this? What was to constitute, in these circumstances, their idea of 'Holiness'? What was to be the basis of their national worship? This last question touches the heart of their dilemma; for it was the fate of the nation, not of individual members of it, which was their primary concern. Israel had tried for centuries to worship Jahweh in its own way, and that way had proved disastrous. Now Jahweh Himself had intervened. After punishing His People 'double for all its sins', He had brought back a remnant to His Holy Land and set it there, once again, among the nations of the heathen. And now He demanded of it one thing first and foremost:

> Ye shall be holy unto me: for I Jahweh am holy, and have separated you from the peoples, that ye should be mine. (Lev. xx. 26)

This was the indispensable requirement, the condition without which no offering could be acceptable. But how was it to be fulfilled? To understand the Priestly writers' answer to this, we have to realize that they expected Jahweh Himself to take the first step.

He would wipe out the past. All the centuries during which Israel had profaned its inheritance would be as though they had never been. A completely fresh start would be made, in which the exile in Babylonia would be treated as a second Wandering in the Wilderness, and Israel would be restored to its old innocence and made once more a Holy People (cf. Jer. xxiii. 7–8). Long ago this had been prophesied by Hosea (ii. 14–20) and now at the end of the age it was repeated by Ezekiel. Once again Jahweh would deliver His People 'with a mighty hand and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out'. Once again He would cause it to 'pass under the rod' and would bring it 'into the bond of the Covenant'. Once again He would 'purge' out its rebels. Then at last the worship of Israel would be acceptable:

For in mine holy mountain,
In the mountain of the height of Israel,
Saith the Lord Jahweh,
There shall all the house of Israel, all of them,
Serve me in the land:
There will I accept them,
And there will I require your offerings,
and the first-fruits of your oblations,
with all your holy things.
As a sweet savour will I accept you,
When I bring you out from the peoples,
And gather you out of the countries wherein ye have been scattered;
And I will be sanctified in you in the sight of the nations.
(Ezek. xx. 33–41.)

The same association of ideas is made by another writer, who foretells the cleansing of Jerusalem and its

overshadowing from thenceforth by the Pillar of Cloud and Fire:

And it shall come to pass, that he that is left in Zion,
And he that remaineth in Jerusalem
shall be called holy,
Even everyone that is written among the living in Jerusalem:
When Jahweh shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion,
And shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof,
By the spirit of judgement,
And by the spirit of burning.
And Jahweh will create over the whole habitation of Mount Zion, and over her assemblies,
A cloud and smoke by day,
And the shining of a flaming fire by night. . . .
(Isa. iv. 3–5)

So, in more general terms Jeremiah had predicted the cleansing of Israel:

And I will cause the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to return,
And will build them, as at the first.
And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity,
Whereby they have sinned against me;
And I will pardon all their iniquities,
Whereby they have sinned against me,
And whereby they have transgressed against me.
(Jer. xxxiii. 7–8)

Such was the unambiguous testimony of the prophets, and the Priestly writers who composed their History and Code in exile took it naturally as the basis for their calculations. They started from the assumption that the People for whom they were to legislate would be holy as the Israel of Moses' day was presumed to

have been holy. But what did 'holiness' mean? In the first place it involved unswerving obedience to the Law. This had been the chief failure of that 'old' Israel which had now ceased to exist, but it was an essential part of the cleansing effected by Jahweh that the 'new' Israel would begin life with an entirely new capacity for faithfulness. Both Jeremiah and Ezekiel had, as we have seen, repeatedly insisted on this point. Jahweh would give His People a heart to know Him, one heart and one way that they might fear Him for ever, a heart of flesh in place of a heart of stone, a new heart, and a new spirit. He would put His law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts. He would put His spirit within them and cause them to walk in His statutes, and keep His judgements, and do them.[1] For the Priestly writers, legislating in anticipation of this glorious renewal, such a prospect meant a simplification of their task. They had only to provide that Israel should understand what statutes and judgements it was expected to obey, and then it should be possible to take its loyal and immediate obedience for granted. So the command 'ye shall be holy: for I Jahweh your God am holy' was a perfectly practicable one according to their viewpoint. Such a thing as deliberate wilful disobedience was unthinkable, or at least, if it should occur, presented no problem to the legislator. A man so void of the right spirit as to 'sin with a high hand' placed himself at once outside the pale, and must be solemnly cut off (excised) from the Holy People.

Moral obedience did not, however, exhaust the idea of 'Holiness' for the Priestly writers, and it is here

[1] Jer. xxiv, 7; xxxii. 39; xxxi. 33; Ezek. xi. 19–20; xxxvi. 26.

that we have need of a specially sympathetic insight into their difficulties. They were looking forward, we must remember, to the day when Israel would hold communion with the Presence of Jahweh 'tabernacling' in fullest reality within the Holy of Holies:

> And there will I meet with the children of Israel; and the tent shall be sanctified by my glory. And I will sanctify the tent of meeting and the altar: Aaron also and his sons will I sanctify, to minister to me in the priest's office. And I will tabernacle among the children of Israel, and will be their God. (Exod. xxix. 43–5)

This is not simply an imaginative reconstruction of the past, it is a vision of the actual and impending future. There in the Temple Jahweh's Glory will meet *us*; and we on our side must leave nothing undone to sanctify both ourselves and all our possessions, so that there may be no danger of profaning this awful and most holy privilege. This was the problem which the Priestly writers had to solve: let us note two points about it at the start. First, this 'profanation' which must at all costs be avoided was confined to unwitting or inadvertent offences. Of this we shall have more to say later, but it follows necessarily from the fact, already mentioned, that deliberate sin was to be visited with instant 'excision'. In such a case the People preserved its own holiness by rooting out the author of the offence. Second, while the *theologumenon* of the Presence, the 'Glory', was wholly immaterial, the question of material *contact* was nevertheless inevitably and always prominent. Once you believe that God has condescended to 'tabernacle', really though incomprehensibly, within a material 'house', you cannot treat either that 'house' or any person or object intimately

associated with it as wholly unaffected by this mystery. To call such a point of view materialistic is to misunderstand its nature. It expresses a certain attitude of mind to a part of the material physical world which is regarded as peculiarly 'holy', and though it is liable when abused to lapse into gross superstition, it reflects one of the most profound and ineradicable instincts of human nature. The instructed Catholic is, of course, well aware of this fact, for he like the Jew has had to face the same problem which he believes to be imposed upon him not by his personal temperament but by his Faith: if God who is Spirit has nevertheless willed to consecrate Matter, how shall we psycho-physical beings best approach and worship in His Presence? Even those who cannot sympathize with this point of view, because they do not share the faith which lies behind it, will at least realize that it is not what the writer of Hebrews thought it, a purely 'carnal' one. It is indeed much more what Otto has described in his famous phrase as 'numinous': deeply felt, it yet defies logical explanation; vague yet compelling, it manifests itself in a thousand forms.

This then was the problem which the Priestly writers had to solve. Since the Divine Presence was once again to 'tabernacle' on earth within the Holy of Holies, the holiness of Israel must be guarded and preserved in its physical aspect also. Every effort must be made to avoid or remove the slightest taint of profanation in respect both of the persons and property of Jahweh's worshippers, of the sacred precincts with their priesthood and furniture, and (not least) of the offerings made at the altar. Each and all of these must be cleansed or undergo 'expiation' (Heb. *Kippēr*, E.V.

'Atonement'), so that Israel might appear before its Lord without spot or blemish. It need hardly be said that the field which had so to be covered was an extremely wide and varied one. The leper and the 'leprous' house, the woman after childbirth, the Nazirite defiled by a sudden death beside him, the man who had touched a corpse, the man who had committed an unwitting or inadvertent offence against Jahweh or his fellow Israelite, all these had to be 'expiated', cleansed, sanctified, whether by some appointed kind of sacrifice, a sin-, or guilt-, offering or by some special rite (like the Water of Un-sin-ment in Num. xix) in which sacrifice and the sprinkling of blood played no part.

So too the Hieron had to be 'expiated' with its priesthood and furniture, and finally, as the climax of the entire process, the Holy Place of the Naos. But what of the Holy of Holies? This brings us to an extremely significant and interesting point in the history of post-exilic Judaism. That the Holy of Holies could require 'expiation' was unthinkable to anyone who believed that the Presence of Jahweh 'tabernacled' within the Veil; and it is quite certain that the Exilic writers would have rejected the idea with horror. They looked forward to a Sanctuary similar in all respects to the Tabernacle of Mosaic days; a Sanctuary, that is, where the 'Glory' dwelt in dreadful majesty, so that no man but Moses, no! not even Aaron, might presume to 'draw near to the thick darkness where God was' (the reference is actually to Horeb but is equally applicable to the Sanctuary). As for the 'expiation' of the Mercy Seat, the very idea of such a thing was a blasphemy, for it was tantamount to a

denial that Jahweh Himself the Sanctifier was enthroned upon it! We find, accordingly, that in Ezekiel's vision of the new Temple the 'cleansing of the sanctuary' is limited to three points:

> And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin offering, and put it upon the door posts of the house [the Naos] and upon the four corners of the ledge of the altar, and upon the posts of the gate of the inner court.
>
> (Ezek. xlv. 19.)

Here the rites of 'expiation' are not even carried over the threshold of the Naos, since the 'Glory' of Jahweh fills the whole of it (xliii. 5)—but this was not the view of the Priestly writers. Their regulations, which were much more elaborate, began with the sanctification of 'the Tabernacle and all that was therein' with the anointing oil, after which the altar was 'expiated' by the blood of the sin offering (Lev. viii. 10, 15). This was the inaugural rite and it was possibly all that the Code contained in its original form: later writers, however, added detailed laws about the sin offerings, which have an important bearing on the subject. In two of these, the sin offering of the High Priest and that offered for the whole People, the blood was ordered to be brought into the Holy Place where it was sprinkled seven times before the Veil and also put on the horns of the altar of incense. The purpose of this ceremony was not, however, to 'cleanse' the Naos but to expiate the (unwitting) sins of those whose sacrifice it was, that they might be forgiven (Lev. iv. 1–21). It is only with the story of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x. 1–7), who offered 'strange fire' in their censers 'before Jahweh', that we reach something like the purificatory rites of Ezekiel. The sequel of this story is

in Lev. xvi, where Aaron is warned that he must not come 'at all times into the Holy Place'. As this passage now stands it is an ordinance for the 'expiation' of the Mercy Seat, but the fact that the 'Holy Place' alone is mentioned shows that this was not its original intention. Actually the whole chapter is a confused medley in which scholars have discerned four distinct elements of different dates. With these we need not here concern ourselves, but it is necessary to note two points. First, the original meaning of the rite seems to survive in verse 16:

> And he shall make expiation for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions . . .

We have here, in fact, a rite exactly parallel to that prescribed by Ezekiel (though the latter was to be half-yearly, while this is an annual purification); and the general intention of it can probably still be gathered from the independent statute at the end of the same chapter (Lev. xvi. 29–34):

> In the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and shall do no manner of work, . . . for on this day shall atonement be made for you, to cleanse you; from all your sins shall ye be clean before Jahweh. . . .
>
> 'And the priest, who shall be anointed . . . shall make the atonement . . . and he shall make atonement for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make atonement for the tent of meeting and for the altar; and he shall make atonement for the priests and for all the people of the assembly.

Though the expressions used here are ambiguous there is nothing to indicate that this 'cleansing' was to proceed any further than the Holy Place: it is to be

noted also that as in Ezekiel it is an act by which the Sanctuary is purified in a quite general sense, i.e. without reference to specific sins committed by the High Priest or the People as in Lev. iv.

Why then has a later writer found it necessary to modify this rite, so that it becomes an 'expiation' of the Holy of Holies[1] and even of the Mercy Seat which was the earthly throne of the Presence? To this there can surely be only one answer. It is because he knows that the 'Glory' is present there in figure, not in reality: therefore the Holy of Holies has to be purified quite as much as any other part of the Temple. We see here the difference between the fervent hopes of the first exilic writers of this Code and the sober actuality of the Second Temple.

'It was the belief of the Jews that the glory of the Lord did not dwell in the Most Holy Place in the second Temple. The Talmud (Yoma 9*b*) explains this on the ground that God only dwells in the tents of Shem; not of Japheth, of whom Cyrus was a descendant. This was deplored, and the promises of more intimate fellowship to be enjoyed by the Church in the Messianic age are in the Targum all made to predict the presence of the Shekinah.'[2]

Meanwhile the sad fact had to be recognized and dealt with in a practical manner; and the Mishnah throws an interesting sidelight on the result. The Tractate Middôth, speaking of the Upper Chamber which formed the upper story of the Naos and in which

[1] It will be noted that the alteration has been made so awkwardly that the 'Holy Place' is allowed to stand here, uniquely and quite incorrectly, for the Holy of Holies.

[2] J. T. Marshall, 'Shekinah', *H.D.B.*, vol. iv, p. 489. The 'Shekinah', i.e. quite literally the 'tabernacling' Presence, is the latest of all the *theologumena* used to describe this mystery.

the division between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies was marked by flagstones, tells us that there were openings from it into the Holy of Holies 'by which they used to let down the workmen in boxes, so that they should not feast their eyes on the Holy of Holies'.[1] And this was the place which only the High Priest might enter once in the year!

But this was not the only modification to which the Priestly Code was forced by hard facts to submit; there was another, which in this case has left no sign in the Old Testament itself. Only too soon it became apparent that if the Presence had not yet returned to the Sanctuary, the promised 'cleansing' of Israel by Jahweh was equally an event of the future. The ideal Israel with its new heart and new spirit was palpably not yet in existence; and it became necessary to relax the rigid austerity of the Code, which had required 'excision' from the People in the event of a single heinous or presumptuous offence. So, after naming the specific cases in which the sin-, and guilt-, offerings 'expiate', the Mishnah goes on to say that these same offences, even if committed presumptuously, are 'expiated' by the special sin-offering of the Day of Atonement. 'For all other transgressions, venial or grave, wanton or unwitting, conscious or unconscious, sins of omission or of commission, sins punishable by Extirpation [Excision] or by death at the hands of the court, the scapegoat makes atonement [expiates].[2] But the process could not stop there. Since according to the theory of the Priestly Code it was only unwitting or inadvertent offences which could be wiped out by

[1] Danby, *Mishnah*, p. 596 (Mid. iv. 5).
[2] Danby, p. 410 (Shebuoth i. 6).

'expiation', the question of repentance and forgiveness hardly arose. The uncleanness contracted by these offences was rather 'numinous' than moral and was not such as to lay a grave burden on the conscience. But the moment this theory broke down, the case was completely altered. If these rites were to be regarded as 'expiatory' for sins of *every* description, 'venial or grave, wanton or unwitting', their character was fundamentally transformed: from being merely the 'numinous' means of preserving the 'holiness' of a Holy People, they became in effect 'sacraments of penance' for sinners. That they were held to be entirely efficacious, as such, in procuring the remission of sins goes without saying, since they were believed to be the ordinances provided for this very purpose by God: but it is obvious that, as in the Catholic sacramental system, they might easily be treated as little better than magical. It is interesting to note how this problem was dealt with by the practical piety of the rabbis. Thus the Mishnah teaches that while the sin-, and guilt-, offerings 'expiated' the offences (always unwitting or inadvertent) for which they were specifically appointed, death and the Day of Atonement 'expiated' *all* sins if accompanied by repentance; while repentance by itself 'expiated' venial sins and suspended the *punishment* of heinous sins till they could be 'expiated' in proper form by the rites of the next Day of Atonement.[1]

'If a man said, "I will sin and repent, and sin again and repent", he will be given no chance to repent. [If he said] "I will sin and the Day of Atonement will effect atonement", then the Day of Atonement effects no atonement. For trans-

[1] *Yoma* viii. 8.

gressions that are between man and God the Day of Atonement effects atonement, but for transgressions that are between a man and his fellow the Day of Atonement effects atonement only if he has appeased his fellow . . . R. Akiba said: Blessed are ye, O Israel. Before whom are ye made clean and who makes you clean? *Your Father in heaven; as it is written, And I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean.*'[1]

We can see here quite clearly the mingling of two really distinct ideas, that of numinous 'expiation' on the one hand and of forgiveness on the other. The rabbis were, in fact, in a dilemma. No one knew better than they did, to judge from their recorded utterances, that uprightness and goodness of character are superior to sacrifice, or that repentance is an essential condition for the forgiveness of sins: for them worship was valueless if it was not the true worship of the heart and will. And yet they could not ignore the ordinances of a Code which Moses had received through angels from the Hand of God. Even if they recognized that the Holy of Holies had not yet received back the 'tabernacling' Presence, the ancient symbolism must still be preserved and honoured. For always there was the Temple, the earthly focus of Israelite devotion, where the People must appear even now in holiness, and where one day the fulness of the Godhead would reign gloriously for ever. If then on the one side their natural inclination was to worship their 'Father in heaven' without the use of any material media, on the other side they knew well that the worship of *Israel* must always be mutilated and defective, if it lacked a material, ritual, sacrificial means of expres-

[1] Ib. 9.

sion. To suppose that the rabbis found complete satisfaction in the 'simple and edifying worship of the synagogue' would certainly be quite erroneous. They may have found it difficult to harmonize the moral and the numinous aspects of their religion, just as they would have found it difficult, if not impossible, to explain what they thought would happen when the 'Glory' returned. No doubt also there were 'liberals' among them, as there are 'liberal' Jews to-day, to whom both the mystery of the Presence and the ritual associated with it were alike uncongenial. But for a loyal and instructed Jew there could be no question of negating what was in effect the essence of the Covenant. Whatever it might ultimately be found to mean, however long and for whatever reasons it might tarry, the promise stood sure which separated Israel from every other nation on earth:

> I will set my tabernacle among you:
> And my soul shall not abhor you.
> And I will walk among you,
> And will be your God,
> And ye shall be my people.
> (Lev. xxvi. 11–12)

A word may be said in conclusion on the general character of Temple worship after the Exile. It is tempting to suppose, after studying the Priestly Code and the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, that the keynote of this was necessarily somewhat sombre. We are apt to picture the Jews as unable to escape from the consciousness of their sins and thus as being providentially prepared for the true Atonement which was to be made upon the Cross. But this idea is doubly fallacious. In the first place it overlooks the fact that, for all the Priestly Code's instructions about sin- and guilt-offer-

ings, only one day in the year was devoted to national 'expiation', and in the second place it assumes that this 'expiation' was felt to be too 'carnal' to be fully effective, and that as a result no act of worship was entirely carefree. Christian apologetics are, no doubt, responsible for this misreading of the situation, a misreading which owes much, in particular, to the academic treatment of the subject by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews.[1] It requires an effort to realize that the post-exilic Jew was not in the least uneasy about the forgiveness of his sins, and that while the affliction of Israel weighed upon his heart and often drove him to the visionary consolations of apocalyptic, he never ceased to find abundant happiness and cause for thanksgiving in the immemorial worship which centred around the altar. What that worship could be and could mean it needs no more than a single illustration to show us:

How glorious was [Simon the great priest] when the people gathered around him
At his coming forth out of the sanctuary!
As the morning star in the midst of a cloud,
As the moon at the full:
As the sun shining forth upon the temple of the Most High...
When he took up the robe of glory,
And put on the perfection of exultation,
In the ascent of the holy altar,
He made glorious the precinct of the sanctuary ...
Then shouted the sons of Aaron,
They sounded the trumpets of beaten work,
They made a great noise to be heard
For a remembrance before the Most High.
Then all the people together hasted,
And fell down upon the earth on their faces

[1] Appendix p. 287.

To worship their Lord, the Almighty, God Most High.
The singers also praised him with their voices;
In the whole house was there made sweet melody.
And the people besought the Lord Most High,
In prayer before him that is merciful,
Till the worship of the Lord should be ended;
And so they accomplished the service.
Then he went down, and lifted up his hands
Over the whole congregation of the children of Israel,
To give blessing unto the Lord with his lips
And to glory in his name. . . .

(Ecclus. l. 5–7, 11, 16–20)

After reading a description like this we may well ask what the Jews lacked which Christians have since obtained. It was certainly not the capacity for adoration: can Christian Eucharistic worship outshine 'spiritually' or ceremonially the glory of this scene in the Temple? But if not this, what then? It was not the knowledge and practice of moral righteousness: in that, even to this day, the Jew too often puts the Christian to shame. It was not the knowledge of God as a Heavenly Father: though Christians have tried to maintain that our Lord originated this thought, it had actually been long familiar to the Jews, and Christ Himself took this familiarity for granted. It was not a sense of sin: the Jews had this in a highly developed form. It was not the need for forgiveness; did God forgive no one before Christ came (as the writer of Hebrews suggests)? What was it then? If Christians can use the Jewish Psalter daily in their churches because its devotional language has not been surpassed in the course of nineteen centuries of Grace, wherein is their religion superior to that of the Old Covenant? Surely it is high

time that this question was faced with complete frankness and honesty? For the truth is that it has not been faced hitherto. Christians have been content to echo the arguments which they find in the New Testament without questioning how far the experience of these centuries has proved them true. And then they wonder why not only Jews but even Mohammedans show themselves so strangely insensitive to the Gospel message! Is it perhaps that Christians themselves have not yet understood the fulness of their own Faith? Have they been thinking of it all the time as a type of monotheism which can be classed with Judaism and Islam and yet is (in some not very obvious way) a better kind of monotheism? To put it in a word, have Christians forgotten the 'tabernacling' Presence, the one feature of Revealed Religion, whether Jewish or Christian, which sets it at once apart from all other religious systems?

But the Jews themselves never forgot and never have forgotten. All their passionate longing for that Temple, the ruins of which have passed into alien hands, is rooted and has been rooted for centuries in this abiding memory. They at least know what they lack—and what has been promised them. Through all the years in which the mystery of the dualism of the Divine Presence has haunted and perplexed them they have looked forward to a consummation which will solve the riddle for ever and reconcile the contradiction which seems to be inherent in it:

> 'And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be with brightness and with gloom: but it shall be one day which is known unto Jahweh; not day, and not night: but it shall come to pass, that at evening time there shall be light.

'And it shall come to pass in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the eastern sea, and half of them toward the western sea: in summer and in winter shall it be. And Jahweh shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall Jahweh be one, and his Name one.' (Zech. xiv. 6–9)

PART II

THE NEW COVENANT

Chapter VII

ST. MARK

BEFORE we begin our study of the New Testament, some words of introduction are needed. It is essential, in the first place, that we should approach this inquiry with a fresh and open mind; and this is admittedly not easy. The New Testament is so familiar to us that we can hardly believe that it holds any surprises in store; and the very suggestion of unsuspected depths which have still to be fathomed may merely provoke our antagonism. Nor is this all. If these depths do really exist, they must profoundly affect the problem of our Lord's consciousness of His Godhead; and the conclusions to be drawn from them may prove extremely unwelcome, if we are not prepared in advance to admit their possibility. It requires an effort, in fact, to realize that the New Testament is still to a great extent a *terra incognita*, and that to hold preconceived ideas of any kind about it is the surest way of leaving it so.

In the second place it is necessary that we should realize the nature of the evidence with which we shall have to deal. It is widely recognized now that even in the second Gospel we have something more than a plain account of our Lord's Ministry and Death, but how *much* more exactly have we than this? How far is St. Mark's interpretation of the facts his own? Must we not assume that he is relying in the main upon the common tradition which was prevalent in the Church of his day; and, if so, to what extent was this tradition derived from the teaching of Christ Himself? These are questions to which we must at least attempt an answer,

however conjectural the results may be; for the gap which exists in our knowledge (though not of course in fact) between our Lord's Resurrection and the first written document of the New Testament cannot be left entirely empty. Between these two points we have years of active evangelism of which only the barest outline is given us in Acts; years too of Church life, based upon 'the apostles' teaching and fellowship' and 'the breaking of bread and the prayers', of which we possess only such scanty and indirect evidence as survives in the letters of St. Paul. It results from this that at no time in the New Testament do we find what the writer of Hebrews calls 'the first principles' of the Gospel. *That* foundation had already been laid long ago, and it was not the intention of the writers to dwell at length upon what was already familiar. When they wrote, they had behind them a solidly built background of knowledge which they could take for granted; and we must count ourselves fortunate when anything so well known and elementary as (e.g.) the Eucharist occurred to them for special mention.

It is just here that our chief difficulty lies. We can claim, no doubt rightly, to understand what the first Christians meant by 'repentance from dead works and faith toward God', or by 'the teaching of baptism(s), and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgement', because these are a part of our own Christian experience. But our task is to go behind these. We have to discover what they first learned about the Person and work of their Saviour and how they learned it; and we have to glean this knowledge not so much from the direct statements of the Evangelists as from the allusions which they make to

beliefs and doctrines which their readers would be assumed to share. How hard it may be to do this can be seen from a single illustration. If there is one fact in Sacred History for which we should expect to find the clear warrant of prophecy, it is the Resurrection of Christ upon the third day; and we are repeatedly assured in the New Testament that such a warrant exists. St. Paul tells us that He 'hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures'. St. Luke speaks of our Lord opening the minds of His disciples that they might understand the Scriptures: 'Thus it is written that the Christ should suffer, and rise again the third day from the dead.' St. John recalls the time when 'as yet they knew not the scriptures, that he must rise again from the dead'.[1] But what and where is this 'scripture'? It is surely remarkable that in only one of the passages in which the Resurrection on the third day is mentioned do the Revisers of our English Version cite (and then merely for comparison) the only words in the Old Testament which seem to be at all relevant.[2] Let us, however, examine this prophecy in full:

I will go and return to my place,
Till they acknowledge their offence, and seek my Presence!
In their affliction they will seek me earnestly saying,
Come, and let us return unto Jahweh:
For he hath torn, and he will heal us;
He hath smitten, and he will bind us up.
After two days will he revive us:
On the third day he will raise us up,
And we shall live before him.
And let us know, let us follow on to know Jahweh;

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 4; Luke xxiv. 46; John xx. 9.

[2] Marginal ref. to 1 Cor. xv. 4. On Hos. vi. 2 a similar reference, for comparison only, is made to Luke xxiv. 27, 44; John ii. 22; xx. 9.

His going forth is sure as the morning:
And he shall come unto us as the rain,
As the latter rain that watereth the earth.
(Hos. v. 15–vi. 3)

Obviously at first sight there is no direct connexion here between this prospective revival of a repentant Israel and the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. And yet there can be no doubt that this was the 'scripture' upon which our Lord based His prediction and from which He later expounded its meaning. Not only is there no other passage in the Old Testament which alludes explicitly to a resurrection 'after two days', or 'on the third day', but it is clear from the slip which St. Mark consistently makes ('after *three* days') and which St. Matthew (with one exception) and St. Luke, as well as St. Paul, avoid ('on the third day') that they all had this prophecy in mind.[1] But what does this mean? Are we to believe that our Lord interpreted the Scriptures so mechanically that He could wrench these few words out of their context in order to apply them to Himself? And why should He do so? What was there so specially important about this particular interval of time that it must be singled out like this? Or are we to suppose that this mention of 'the third day' was seized upon by the Apostles *after* the Resurrection and applied to it by them, with complete indifference to the rest of the prophecy, because they could find nothing more appropriate? Surely we can find a better answer than this!

Let us recall first the often repeated statement that the disciples *could not understand* what our Lord meant when He predicted His Passion and Resurrection: 'As

[1] Mark viii. 31; x. 34; Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 23; xx. 19 (xxvii. 63); Luke ix. 22; xviii. 33; xxiv. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 4.

yet they knew not the scripture' (John xx. 9; cf. Luke xviii. 34; xxiv. 44–7, &c.). This at once suggests that the prophecies to which He was referring did not carry their meaning on the surface: they needed to be illuminated by a fuller knowledge of Him to whom they pointed. This knowledge came to the disciples after the Resurrection. They learned then, in the first place, to recognize in their Master the mysterious figure of the Holy Servant who was to 'bear the sin of many'; but they learned this not because He had suffered but because He had risen again. It was the fact of the Resurrection which enabled them to understand the Scriptures, because it finally convinced them of the truth, which they had already dimly perceived, that this Holy One was indeed the Son of God. Then all their difficulties and perplexities vanished. Then they realized how all those scriptures were being fulfilled which spoke of Jahweh Himself delivering His People, seeking His lost sheep, sprinkling them with cleansing water, giving them a new heart, and pouring His Spirit upon them. All these things were being done (or had been done) under their eyes, not by an angel but by One who was Himself the very Presence of God; One who, coming in the form of the Servant, had performed the Servant's task and was now 'declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, *by the resurrection of the dead*' (Rom. i. 4).

So we find St. Paul himself clearing up our difficulty. He might easily have written the more usual words 'by the resurrection *from* the dead', but he desired to indicate a deeper truth with which his readers might be assumed to be familiar; *the truth which must leap to the mind the moment the prophecy of Hosea is applied to our Lord's*

Resurrection. 'We were buried with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life' (Rom. vi. 4). That was the truth which St. Paul had in mind when he began his epistle, and he *expected* his readers to be familiar with it (cf. 'or are ye ignorant?' vi. 3). One of the first things they had learned as Christians was to think of our Lord's Resurrection not as a personal glorification of the Christ but as an act of quickening power which procured the resurrection of all those who should 'seek Him earnestly'.[1] It was, in fact, not the bald reference to the 'two days' which linked this prophecy with its fulfilment but the profound mystery of a new and risen Israel to which it pointed. This was what God had promised, this was what He had done; but He had done it (*mirabile dictu*!) by Himself tasting death. And what voice could predict this great act more fittingly than that of the prophet who proclaimed most passionately the inexhaustible depths of the Divine Love?

It has been worth while spending some little time on this illustration, because it exemplifies all the points mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. It shows the need for approaching the New Testament with a fresh mind; and this means in particular a mind which sets it against its proper historical background and sees it as the record of a mature Christian experience, not as a manual of elementary instruction. But equally it shows the need for an open mind. If it is assumed to be impossible *a priori* that our Lord should have taught His

[1] The Greek word in Hos. v. 15 means 'seek me early', and seems to be deliberately echoed by St. Luke (xxiv. 22) in his description of Easter Morning.

disciples to apply to His own Person scriptures which were undeniably intended to refer to Jahweh, there is no more discussion: but then the New Testament must remain largely unintelligible. For the question immediately rises: If it was not He who so 'opened their mind that they might understand the scriptures', is it conceivable that they were able to do so for themselves? And, if they did so, why is their ignorance and lack of understanding so repeatedly insisted upon, and why do they ascribe their enlightenment to Christ Himself? There is surely no sense in disbelieving plain statements of fact when, if we deny them, the mystery remains as great as, and indeed greater than, ever. Only if we accept them, we must be ready to follow them to their logical conclusion: and this certainly seems to be that from the first our Lord knew Himself to be the 'Son of God'.

But if we are prepared to take this view of the matter, it still remains to ask how our Lord interpreted this truth to His disciples. Here again we have to face a difficulty that is peculiarly our own. To us it seems natural and sufficient that our Lord should have claimed the unique relation of Eternal Sonhood; and whether He does this explicitly as in the parable of the husbandmen and the vineyard or only implicitly as in His cry of 'Abba', we do not need to have this thought explained to us. Hence we tend to forget that for the first disciples such a claim would require a great deal of explanation. That a man, especially an anointed king of Israel, might be called in a special sense the 'son' of Jahweh would be quite intelligible to them. Indeed this language is actually used of Solomon in the passage from 2 Samuel which we have already studied (2 Sam.

vii. 14); and similar references in the Psalms (e.g. Ps. ii. 7, 12; lxxxix. 26) could be similarly interpreted. But it was one thing that a mere man should have it said of him, 'Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee': it was quite another that he should claim to have been begotten before the foundations of the world. It must be noted, on the other hand, that the question of blasphemy does not arise at this point, for we are considering the attitude of our Lord's own chosen disciples, not of His enemies. A disciple does not leap to the conclusion that his Master is either blasphemous or insane, when he uses language which seems to give evidence of one or the other of these conditions. He is solely concerned to listen and understand, taking for granted that what he hears must somehow be right, however strange it may sound. Yet a disciple, like everybody else, cannot learn unless he is taught through thought-forms with which he is already familiar; and when he happens to be a Jew this means that he must be taught through the medium of his sacred Scriptures.

Now there was, as we have seen, one mode or aspect of the Divine Activity on earth which was as familiar to every Jew of our Lord's day as the idea of the Divine Sonhood is to us now; and we are not at liberty to ignore its influence simply because it is as strange to us as the idea of Eternal Sonhood would have been strange to the first disciples. On the contrary, it becomes our obvious duty to see what relationship our Lord claimed to this immemorial doctrine of the 'tabernacling' Presence. Always remembering, then, that the evidence we are to study will be purely circumstantial, since it assumes rather than expounds the settled beliefs which the early Church originally received from the Master, let us begin

our investigations with the earliest written 'Gospel' and see what it has to tell us.

The Gospel of St. Mark opens with a passage which requires careful analysis. We note at the start that Jesus Christ is called 'the Son of God', a reading which is not safely to be rejected in view of the manuscript authority in its favour. It is perhaps significant that Severianus observes of St. Mark that after speaking of the Son of God he 'immediately contracts his language and cuts short his conception';[1] for this is the impression which is certainly made upon a reader unfamiliar with the *theologumena* of the Presence. Actually, however, what St. Mark does is to indicate at once the mystery which lies behind this title: *he cites a prophecy which can have one meaning only:*

Behold I send my messenger,
And he shall prepare the way before my Presence:
And the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his Naos,
Even the Angel of the Covenant, whom ye delight in,
Behold, he cometh,
Saith Jahweh Sabaoth.
But who may abide the day of his coming?
And who shall stand when he appeareth?
For he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap:
And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver.
And he shall purify the sons of Levi,
And purge them as gold and silver;
And they shall offer unto Jahweh offerings in righteousness.
Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto Jahweh,
As in the days of old,
And as in ancient years. (Mal. iii. 1–4)

[1] Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in Greek*, 1907, p. 23.

It may be objected that St. Mark quotes only the first two lines of this prophecy and that we cannot assume that he had the rest of it in mind. But the answer to this lies in verse 6, where he describes the Baptist in terms which identify him with Elijah (2 Kings i. 8). This means that St. Mark is thinking of the *whole* passage in Malachi (Mal. iii–iv) in which the 'messenger' is first of all anonymous but is later revealed as 'Elijah the prophet' who is to be sent 'before the great and terrible day of Jahweh come'. The 'beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God' is thus plainly stated to be the fulfilment of this prophecy in the person of the Baptist. He is the promised Elijah who is to herald 'the great and terrible day' of the Lord and to prepare the way before Him. But why is the text changed so that it reads not 'before my Presence' but 'before *thee*'? With the knowledge which we have gained about the 'tabernacling' Presence, we shall have no difficulty in answering this question. What the prophecy of Malachi indicates is that He who will 'suddenly come to His Naos' is at once Jahweh and yet not Jahweh. He is the 'Angel of the Covenant', or in other words the Presence enthroned above the Ark.[1] Thus though Jahweh speaks of sending 'my' messenger, the language changes at once, not indeed into the second but into the third person. The 'Lord' whose return to the Temple was so ardently desired by the Jews would in the fullest sense represent Jahweh, but He could, and indeed must, be distinguished in thought, since the true dwelling-place of Jahweh was in 'heaven'. But when it was believed that this Presence had indeed returned in the person of Jesus Christ, the change from 'my Presence' to 'thee'

[1] See above, pp. 55–8.

was natural and inevitable. The Lord from 'heaven' is then heard speaking directly to the 'Lord' who is to 'tabernacle' on earth, and in whom Redemption and Judgement are alike to find their consummation.[1]

We have not yet, however, spoken of Redemption which is the subject of the second prophecy (Isa. xl ff.) cited by St. Mark; and this we have now to consider. Here again we have no right to assume that, because only the opening lines of this great message of consolation are quoted, we are expected to ignore the remainder. As before, so here the *keynote* of a mystery is struck; and the reader is thus put in touch with a complete new field of thought which he can follow up by studying the later chapters of Isaiah. What does he find there? He finds first the promise that Jahweh Himself is preparing the deliverance of His People; that He will feed His flock as a shepherd (xl. 11), will lead them safely across the wilderness (xli. 18; xlii. 16; xliii. 19); will ransom them (xliii. 3, 14; xliv. 6, &c.); will pour His Spirit upon them (xliv. 3); and, more than this, that He will make His Salvation known to all nations (xliii. 6; xlix. 6), so that every knee shall bow before Him (xlv. 23). And yet side by side with these predictions the reader finds the mysterious figure of the Chosen Servant in whom Jahweh's soul delighteth and who is Anointed with His Spirit (xlii. 1; lxi. 1); who is to be in Himself a 'Covenant of the People' (xlii. 6; xlix. 8) 'to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon', 'to preach good tidings to the meek . . . to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord and the day of vengeance of our God'. Who is this Servant? On the one hand,

[1] Our Lord's reference to Ps. cx. 1, 'The Lord said unto my Lord' should be studied in this connexion (Mark xii. 35–7 and parallels).

he is to suffer scourging and shame and spitting (l. 6) and to make his life an offering for sin (liii. 10). On the other hand, he seems at least once to speak with the accents of Divine Authority:

> Come ye near unto me, hear ye this;
> From the beginning I have not spoken in secret;
> From the time that it was, there am I:
> And now the Lord Jahweh hath sent me, and his spirit.
> (xlviii. 16)

These words are obviously not spoken by a mere man, whether Cyrus (who is mentioned in the preceding verse) or the prophet himself: on the contrary they remind one immediately of the famous passage in Proverbs, so often applied in later days to Christ, in which Wisdom speaks in her own 'person':

> Jahweh possessed me in the beginning of his way,
> Before his works of old.
> I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning,
> Or ever the earth was . . .
> When he established the heavens, I was there:
> When he set a circle upon the face of the deep . . .
> Then I was by him, as a master-workman:
> And I was daily his delight,
> Rejoicing always before him. . . .
> (Prov. viii. 22–3, 27, 30)

It is only a step from this conception to the identification of Wisdom with the 'tabernacling' Presence, which we find in Ecclesiasticus:

> I came forth from the mouth of the Most High,
> And covered the earth as a mist.
> I dwelt in high places,
> And my throne is in the Pillar of Cloud . . .
> Then the Creator of all things gave me commandment;

And he that created me made my tabernacle to rest,
And said, Let thy tabernacle be in Jacob
And thine inheritance in Israel. . . .

In the holy tabernacle I ministered before him;
And so was I established in Sion. . . .
(Ecclus. xxiv 3, 8, 10)

It will be noticed that at the beginning of this passage Wisdom is practically equated with the Word of Jahweh. This thought occurs elsewhere in the Wisdom literature as, for example, in the prayer ascribed to Solomon in Wisdom ix:

O God of the fathers, and Lord who keepest thy mercy
Who madest all things by thy word
And by thy wisdom thou formedst man . . .

Thou gavest command to build a sanctuary in thy holy mountain,
And an altar in the city of thy tabernacling,
A copy of the holy tabernacle which thou preparedst aforehand from the beginning . . .
Send [Wisdom] forth out of the holy heavens,
And from the throne of thy glory bid her come . . .
(Wisdom. ix. 1–2, 8, 10)

Here we have yet another link with the Isaianic prophecies:

Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth:
For I am God, and there is none else.
By myself have I sworn,
The word is gone forth from my mouth in righteousness,
And shall not return [empty],
That unto me every knee shall bow,
Every tongue shall swear.
Only in Jahweh, shall one say unto me, is righteousness and strength . . . (Isa. xlv. 22–4)

And again, in an equally famous passage:

For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven
And returneth not thither, but watereth the earth . . .
So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth:
It shall not return unto me void,
But it shall accomplish that which I please,
And it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.
(Isa. lv. 10–11)

This last prophecy links up with that of Hos. vi. 3 ('the rain that watereth the earth') on the one hand and with the Passion of the Servant ('the pleasure of Jahweh shall prosper in his hand') on the other, while it carries us back, as we have seen, to the fundamental thought that the Redemption promised by Jahweh is to be wrought through the Return of His Presence to Israel. There was, in fact, in the combination of the two prophecies of 'Malachi' and 'Isaiah' an intimate nexus of ideas which only awaited the Coming of the Holy One to receive its final illumination and reconciliation.[1] By the time that St. Mark wrote his 'Gospel', this consummation had become a long-familiar reality, and the Truth which emerged from it needed only to be adumbrated by the briefest Scriptural references.

How then does St. Mark proceed to build up his picture of the 'Lord' who is yet the 'Servant'? He appears to have divided his subject roughly into two halves, of which the first culminates in the confession of St. Peter (viii. 27–31) followed immediately by the Transfiguration (ix. 2–8), and the second in the Resurrection (xvi. 1–8). In the former of these divisions the figure of the 'Lord' predominates, in the latter that of

[1] The *theologumenon* of the almost hypostatized Name (p. 56f.) is also clearly involved here.

the 'Servant'; and in the end the two merge together in the Dying and Risen Christ. It may be well, however, to consider these in greater detail.

The first section opens with the Baptist's announcement of the might of the Coming One and the Spirit-Baptism which He is to give as the Divine Representative of God (i. 8; Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 27). At His own Baptism the 'heavens' are 'rent asunder' and the Spirit descends in bodily form, while a Voice from heaven proclaims His Sonhood in words which recall but utterly transcend the commission of the 'Servant' (i. 10–11; Isa. xlii. 1). Then, after a brief reference to the Temptation, the Ministry opens with the cry that 'the time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand'. From this point onwards the Redemptive Activity of Jahweh promised by the prophets is seen in full operation; and the whole atmosphere is one of amazement and 'numinous' fear (i. 27; ii. 12; iv. 40; v. 15, 33, 42; vi. 51; vii. 37). Though He calls Himself the 'Son of Man', the 'Lord' reveals in every word and action His immediate relationship to God. He teaches with an authority which no rabbi dared to assert (i. 22); He forgives sins (ii. 10); He overrides the law of the Sabbath (ii. 28); He reveals the mystery of the Kingdom (iv. 11). At His command the devils flee, acknowledging His Divine Sovereignty (i. 24, 34; iii. 11; v. 7); at His touch or even merely at His bidding diseases vanish (i. 31, 41–2; ii. 11–12; iii. 5; v. 29; vii. 29–30, 34–5; viii. 22–5); and the dead are revived (v. 41–2). With a word He 'muzzles' the tempest (iv. 39); at His own Will He walks on the sea (vi. 48); twice He feeds a multitude with a few loaves and fishes (vi. 30–44; viii. 1–10). And most astonishing of all, He not only exercises this authority in His own

person but is able to delegate a part of it to His chosen Twelve (iii. 15; vi. 7).

This tremendous picture is not without its shadows. We read of silent doubts (ii. 6) breaking out into open hostility (iii. 6) and blasphemous accusations (iii. 22); of unbelief in 'His own country' (vi. 1–6); of lack of understanding and hardness of heart among His own disciples (vi. 52; viii. 14–21). But the mysterious glory of the 'Lord' is only the more conspicuous against this background and leads intelligibly to St. Peter's confession. St. Mark preserves this answer in its shortest form, 'Thou art the Christ' (viii. 29), to which St. Matthew adds 'the Son of the Living God', an interpretation more probably that of the early Church than of the Apostle himself at that moment. Nevertheless it is clear from what follows that St. Mark expects the title to be associated with the thought of the 'Lord' as the Presence of the Father on earth. The Son as the 'Servant' is to suffer many things and be rejected and killed (viii. 31), but it is then that His true nature will be revealed, for He will return, yet again, in the Glory of His Father (viii. 38; cf. xiii. 26).

This mention of the Glory, not now as identical with the Presence but as the blinding radiance in which the Deity is manifested,[1] brings us to the climax of this first part of St. Mark's 'gospel', the Transfiguration (ix. 2–8). The meaning of this scene is almost entirely lost upon the modern reader if he does not understand what

[1] This change of thought was probably current in our Lord's day. In the Targums the Shekinah is not the Glory but its central cause. Thus except in Zech. ii. 9, the Targumists never use the work Shekinah to translate *Kabod*. The Shekinah is for them the equivalent for the Divine Being, and the Glory is merely its effulgence. See Marshall, 'Shekinah', *H.D.B.*, vol. iv, p. 488.

the writer has in mind. We are carried back in a moment of time to the memory of Horeb, where both Moses and Elijah once met the God of Israel. But now there is One on the mount, mightier far than they, whose whole Being is suddenly irradiated with the Divine Glory. And this Glory is not like that which was once reflected in the face of Moses; it is His own Glory, pouring forth from Him and revealing Him as the 'Lord' of Malachi's prediction. Terror seizes the disciples. St. Peter, wildly searching for words with which to acknowledge the mystery, babbles of building not one but three 'Tabernacles' on this holy ground.[1] Then the Divine Cloud overshadows[2] them with its 'thick darkness', and a Voice proclaims the Divine Sonhood of the 'Lord', and bids them hearken to Him as the Incarnate Word of God.

The *theologumena* of the Covenant are so clearly presented here that comment is needless. St. Mark expects us to assume that from this time onwards the three disciples possessed a knowledge of their Master's 'Lordship' which would later make them true witnesses of His Resurrection. At the moment, however, much more than this must be learned. Already once the warning had been given them that this 'Lord' must 'suffer many things', and now the 'Servant', drawing near to His Passion, again and again repeated the lesson (ix. 12, 31;

[1] How little this scene is commonly understood can be judged from the suggestion made by some commentators that 'tabernacles' must refer to the 'booths' erected for the Feast of Tabernacles (cf. R. V. margin).

[2] Cf. Luke i. 35, 'The power of the Most High shall overshadow thee'. For the 'Glory' cf. Luke ii. 9. In Luke ix. 31 both Moses and Elijah are said to have 'appeared in Glory' (perhaps to explain St. Peter's words) and to have spoken of our Lord's 'Exodus'.

x. 32–4, 45). This does not mean that the earlier note of power and glory is no longer sounded, for the mystery of 'the Christ' lies precisely in this, that it is God who comes to His own and is rejected by them. So, even while He predicts His Passion and teaches His disciples that His mission is to minister to others and be their ransom, He asserts inflexibly His authority over Israel and His judgement upon a 'faithless generation' (ix. 19). For He is the 'Lord' of whom David himself prophesied (xii. 35–7); He is the beloved Son to whom the vineyard of Israel belongs (xii. 1–9); He is the long-expected Saviour, who is to cleanse His Hieron (xi. 15–17) and restore its Naos upon the stone which the builders rejected (xi. 9, cf. Ps. cxviii. 25–6; xii. 10–11, cf. Ps. cxviii. 22). Thus He comes, in fulfilment of the words of Malachi, as the Divine Refiner of Israel. Its day of visitation is upon it. The Vine on which there is 'no cluster to eat', the tree which is barren of the 'first-ripe fig' is doomed to perish at His word (Mic. vii. 4, 1; Mark xi. 12–14, 20; xiii. 2). Now as of old He stands upon the Mount of Olives to pass sentence on the guilty city and to proclaim the desolation of its Sanctuary (Ezek. xi. 23; Mark xiii. 3 ff.; cf. Luke xiii. 34–5).

While therefore it remains true that the second half of St. Mark's 'gospel' is largely devoted to the Passion (xiv–xv) and to our Lord's predictions of it (references above) and teaching about its meaning (cf. ix. 33–7; x. 15, 29–31, 35–45; xi. 25), the suffering of the 'Servant' is never allowed to obscure the majesty and power of the 'Lord'. Rather these two are held close together till the moment comes when the ultimate mystery of Salvation can be disclosed. What, then, is this mystery, and how does St. Mark picture it? The answer, which

has already been indicated, deserves our most careful study. Let us remember once again that St. Mark was not writing a manual of elementary instruction. He was recording in a compact form truths and facts with which Christians of his day had long been familiar, but which they were now to be able to read within the compass of a single document: and the more familiar these truths and facts were, the less need was there for dwelling at length upon them. Unfortunately, as we have seen, this does not mean that they are all of them equally familiar to *us*; and in such a case we are apt either to miss the point of a statement entirely or if confronted with it to treat it with indifference. The answer which we have now to study is an extreme example of this kind, for we have so long ceased to use or to understand the language of 'Nao-morphism' that when we meet it we pass it by without reflection.

St. Mark began his 'gospel' by showing that the 'Christ' who came on earth in the person of Jesus of Nazareth was the long-awaited Presence, who was once more to 'tabernacle' in the midst of Israel. He writes, that is, from the very start in the language of 'Nao-morphism'; and it would be strange indeed if after this he were silent on the very point at which this mystery reached its consummation. Actually he is very far from silent. It is he, in the first place, of all the Evangelists who gives the longest description of the 'false witness' brought against our Lord:

> 'We heard him say, I will destroy this Naos that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands.' (xiv. 58)[1]

[1] Matt. xxvi. 61, 'I am able to destroy this Naos and to build it in three days.' St. Luke omits the charge altogether.

That this 'witness' was not *entirely* 'false' (in the sense that our Lord never Himself said any of these words) may be regarded as certain. St. John, as we shall have occasion to note later, says that the words actually used by Jesus were:

> 'Destroy this Naos and in three days I will raise it up!' (John ii. 19)

But we have better, because earlier, evidence in St. Mark himself. If language *of this kind*, whatever the precise words, had not been used by Jesus according to the tradition which St. Mark had received, he would never have made a point of including a reference to it in the cries of mockery which were raised against our Lord upon the Cross:

> 'They that passed by railed on him wagging their heads, and saying, Ha! thou that destroyest the Naos, and buildest it in three days, save thyself, and come down from the cross. In like manner also the chief priests mocking him among themselves with the scribes said, He saved others; himself he cannot save. Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the Cross, that we may see and believe.' (xv. 29–32)

The juxtaposition and comparison ('In like manner') of these two pieces of raillery proves conclusively that they stood for St. Mark on one and the same level. Indeed the whole point of his mentioning them was the profoundly ironical thought that they *both* revealed, in the very act of denying, the truth. It was because Jesus *was* the Christ, the Saviour of the world, that He would not save Himself; it was because He *would* raise up His Naos in three days that He would not come down from the Cross. And if any further proof of the meaning of this last statement were needed, it could be found in

the event which is recorded as immediately following our Lord's Death. *The Veil of the Naos was 'rent in twain from the top to the bottom'* (xv. 38). In that hour (so we are to understand) a new Covenant was inaugurated in the Blood of the Servant (xiv. 24), and therefore in that same hour the old Sanctuary of the Presence ceased to 'have standing' (Heb. ix. 8). The 'Lord' had indeed 'come suddenly to His Naos', both to build and to destroy.

Here then we have the testimony of the first written 'Gospel', and once we have made ourselves acquainted with the thought-forms which it has carried over from the Old Testament its character is astonishingly clear. St. Mark *states* the Eternal Sonhood of our Lord in his opening sentence, but he *expounds* it in terms of the age-long Covenant-mystery which the Old Testament had left unsolved and unfulfilled. For Jesus in fulfilling the Scriptures had shown His disciples not only why 'it behoved the Christ to suffer' but what it meant that He must 'enter into His Glory' (Luke xxiv. 26). In Him the gap between 'heaven' and the earthly Tabernacle was bridged; since, being on earth as a man, He had yet accomplished all that God Himself had promised to do for Israel: and those who acknowledged in Him the features of the Anointed Servant found that they were the features also of the Beloved Son. It needed, in truth, only the clue of the Person of the Risen Christ to set their feet on the right path to understanding, for we have seen that for centuries the conception of the 'tabernacling' Presence had been on the very verge of hypostatization. Not only had the Divine Name come to be treated at times as 'really a personified power placed side by side with the proper person of

Jahweh',[1] but the Presence had been manifested to Ezekiel in the 'likeness as of the appearance of a man'.[2] That these were merely symbolic attempts to describe an incomprehensible yet inescapable mystery goes without saying; yet they prepared the way for the confession of the Incarnate 'Lord'. Only one step then remained, to decide upon His relationship to God. By itself the prophecy of Malachi did nothing to determine this problem, for the 'Angel of the Covenant' was an ambiguous and perhaps deliberately equivocal term.[3] Here, therefore, new illumination was needed, and St. Mark records how, apart from our Lord's own witness about Himself, the mystery of His Sonhood was twice proclaimed from 'heaven'. So the disciples came to a full knowledge of their Master's Person, while at the same time their eyes were opened to new and unsuspected depths in the Nature of God. Being Jews they had been accustomed to think of Jahweh as the Father of Israel, His 'first-born', but now they found Fatherhood in the very heart of the Eternal Being. How did they relate this new Revelation to the Redemption of which they were called to be the witnesses? How, in particular, did they use it to illustrate the promised consummation, when Jahweh would truly 'tabernacle' in Zion? This is the problem which we have next to consider; and it may be claimed not unfairly that the first step towards its solution was taken through the genius of the first martyr, St. Stephen.

[1] Kautzsch, cited above, p. 52.
[2] See above, p. 88.
[3] See above, p. 56.

Chapter VIII

ST. STEPHEN

BEFORE we embark upon the main subject of this chapter there is one obvious question which must be faced: why do we begin with St. Stephen? It seems certainly strange at first sight that we should have to do so. Antecedently we should have expected to find the fulness of the Revelation 'in Christ' developed, if not immediately, at any rate after no long interval, by those who were His most intimate companions 'from the baptism of John unto the day when He was received up'. Actually, however, this was not what occurred. It is a remarkable thing, for example, that the Twelve seemed, even after Pentecost, so slow to understand the Church's mission to the Gentiles that in spite of the Divine commission to St. Peter to preach the Gospel to Cornelius, it was St. Paul not St. Peter who became in the end the great Doctor of the Nations. It is not our business here to find reasons for this fact; but it behoves us to take notice of it, for much the same apparent tardiness of perception seems to manifest itself in the field of Christian doctrine. As an illustration of this we may consider the speeches of St. Peter recorded in Acts ii. 14–36 and iii. 12–26. These speeches (if we may take them substantially as they are reported) would of course have been intended as 'milk for babes', and we should not expect to find in them any very large admixture of the stronger meat. But this consideration is not enough by itself to explain why it was St. Stephen and not St. Peter who raised the deeper issues which divided Judaism from the new Faith and brought down

upon the whole Church, '*except the apostles*', its first 'great persecution'.

In his first speech, that made on the day of Pentecost, St. Peter preaches Jesus in what seems to us to be strangely reserved and ambiguous language. He is 'the man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders which God did by him' who, having been put to death, has been raised up by God because He is the expected Messiah, the 'fruit of the loins' of David (who prophesied of Him that he would not 'see corruption'):

> 'Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath poured forth this which ye see and hear.' (Acts ii. 33)

St. Peter refers, of course, to the gift of tongues which he has already interpreted as the outpouring of the Spirit prophesied by Joel 'in the last days'. Jesus is able to do this from heaven, because He has ascended thither (ii. 34), having been made by God for Israel 'both Lord and Christ' (the former title alluding to Ps. cx. 1, 'The Lord said unto my Lord', &c.). All this seems far removed from what was to be later St. Mark's 'gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God'. The impression given here is rather that of a human Messiah who having been God's agent on earth has now been glorified by Him, through resurrection, with superhuman powers. And yet it is clear at the same time that St. Peter intends much more than this; for he expressly identifies (ii. 38) the Name of Jesus with that 'Name of the Lord' which according to Joel will bring salvation to all who call upon it. Later, indeed, he asserts this even more emphatically before the Jewish authorities:

'In none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved.' (Acts. iv. 12)

St. Peter's second speech (that made in Solomon's Porch) reveals the same kind of ambiguous reserve. Here Jesus is presented as the Holy and Righteous Servant of Isaiah (iii. 13, 26), the Christ who came to suffer that the sins of Israel might be blotted out (iii. 18–19) and who having been raised by God from the dead (iii. 15) has been glorified by Him (iii. 13) in heaven. From thence God will send Him, as Israel's appointed Christ, in the 'times of the restoration of all things' (iii. 20–1): meanwhile let Israel acknowledge Him as the prophet foretold by Moses, disobedience to whom will be punished with utter destruction from among the People (iii. 22–3). Once again we seem to have a picture of a purely human Christ who because He has been God's agent has been highly exalted by Him and is now reserved in 'heaven' for the last great day of the world. And yet at the same time, both here and later (v. 31), St. Peter does not hesitate to call Jesus the Prince of Life, while he ascribes the healing of the lame man solely to the power of His Name (iii. 16).

It may very well be, as we have already suggested, that the Apostles were careful to make their first addresses as simple and easy as possible; and that with this in view St. Peter thought it wiser to begin with the popular conception of the Christ as the son of David and to work on from this, still on the purely human side, to the identification of this 'Christ' with the mysterious figure of the Servant. After all it was not for him to interpret the Scriptures to his countrymen. He was not a rabbi, not a scholar; he was first and last a *witness*.

His task, in short, was not so much to expound *who* his Master was as to announce the crucial fact that He had died and risen again. If we accept this view of the matter we are certainly in a much better position to form a judgement about St. Peter's speeches, and in particular to understand the limitation of their point of view. It is quite intelligible, for example, that a good deal should be stated in them about Jesus without argument or explanation. Who He really was; how His Name could have such power for Salvation and healing; by what authority He could 'blot out' sins: all this might well be passed over in silence. 'Never mind about all that for the moment', we can imagine St. Peter saying. 'What you have to grasp first is that we saw Him after He had risen from the dead and we saw Him ascend into heaven; and what you see now is the direct result of that Resurrection and Ascension. These are *facts*, of which we are sent to you as witnesses; and they are a sign that God is calling you to repentance and has given you through Jesus the remission of your sins.'

At the same time, even if we accept this reading of the situation, it remains true that St. Peter represents in these speeches what would be called in our day a 'reduced Christianity' but was actually a gospel which had not attained to its fulness. It will be remembered that when we were examining the prophecies of Ezekiel we noticed that the renewal of the Covenant-relationship was described in two stages.[1] There was first a preliminary purification of Israel by Jahweh:

> I will sprinkle clean water upon you
> And ye shall be clean:

[1] See above, p. 91.

From all your filthiness, and from all your idols
Will I cleanse you.
A new heart also will I give you,
And a new spirit will I put within you:
And I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh,
And I will give you an heart of flesh.
And I will put my spirit within you.
(Ezek. xxxvi. 25–7)

But this, though indispensable, *was* still only the preliminary preparation of Israel for the Consummation which was to follow, namely 'the Communion in perfect holiness between the People and the Presence'.[1] This Consummation, this perfection of 'At-one-ment', was to find its centre in the new Naos, where Jahweh was to 'tabernacle' for ever in the midst of His own, and whence the Living Waters were to flow forth, carrying sweetness and healing to the world. It is important to notice here that the gift of Jahweh's 'Spirit' to His People is connected with the first, not with the second, stage of this promised renewal; and the same distinction appears to be made in the prophecy of Joel. The prediction of the outpouring of the Spirit which St. Peter interprets of Pentecost occurs at the *beginning* of the final Consummation (Joel ii. 28–32). It is followed by the gathering of the nations to the Valley of Jehoshaphat (Joel iii. 1–12) and the reaping of that great world-harvest (Joel iii. 13); and then at last the climax is announced:

So shall ye know that I am Jahweh your God,
Tabernacling in Zion my holy mountain:
Then shall Jerusalem be holy,

[1] See above, p. 92.

And there shall no strangers pass through her any more.
And it shall come to pass in that day,
That the mountains shall drop down sweet wine,
And the hills shall flow with milk,
And all the brooks of Judah shall flow with waters;
And a fountain shall come forth of the house of Jahweh
And shall water the valley of Shittim.

(Joel iii. 17–18)

When we re-examine St. Peter's speeches in the light of these considerations, it becomes evident that, whatever he may have thought about the nature of this final Consummation, he does not expressly allude to it at all. What he is concerned with is purely the preliminary purification, the 'remission' or 'blotting out' of sins, which has been accomplished by God through His Holy Servant Jesus. Perhaps, indeed, we may go even further than this. When St. Peter speaks of our Lord as being 'received' by the 'heaven' until the 'times of the restoration of all things', he seems to think of the Consummation as an event entirely in the future; he regards it, in other words, in exactly the same way as the Jews themselves regarded it. To this extent, then, the Incarnation has added nothing to the promises made through the prophets. Jesus has performed His work on earth and has now been exalted to 'heaven'; and there He will remain till He is sent at the last day to vindicate His People. It is, of course, true that this statement does not imply the complete isolation of Jesus from His Church, since He pours forth upon it from 'heaven' the gift of Holy Spirit. But what is meant here by 'Holy Spirit'? We can hardly doubt that St. Peter is thinking of the outward and visible *charismata* which manifested themselves in those early days at the moment of the laying-on

of hands (cf. Acts viii. 18; xix. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 4–11).[1] If this is so, however, there is nothing about these 'gifts' which distinguishes them in kind from similar manifestations recorded in the Old Testament. Indeed the very fact that they are pictured as 'coming down' from 'heaven' betrays their identity: they are thought of as powers imparted to human beings from without (just as of old Jahweh filled men with His Spirit), not as the signs of a 'tabernacling' Presence, which has constituted our human nature as its Naos, so that the Living Waters well up softly from within. This vital distinction between 'Holy Spirit' as we read of it in the Old Testament and the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit which is, even here and now, the Consummation of the Atonement is one that is far too often overlooked, with disastrous results to our theology. We shall return to it later for closer examination, but it is important to notice here that St. Peter seems to be unaware of it. Nor is this at all unnatural, since only a mature experience of the 'tabernacling' Spirit could reveal the full wonder of this New Creation. At Pentecost and for some considerable time afterwards the 'gift' of the Holy Spirit was almost certain to be misinterpreted and only partially understood.

St. Peter, then, does not speak of the Consummation in these early addresses. Or, rather, he does not proclaim it as the essential climax of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; the climax which because of His Incarnation is an event not of the distant future but of the happy and glorious present. Hence, to put it in terms with which we are now familiar, he never speaks of the new Naos which was raised 'on the third day';

[1] This seems to be also what the writer of Hebrews means by the Holy Spirit. See below, p. 289 f.

and beyond a single reference to the 'stone which the builders rejected' (iv. 11)[1] he says nothing to suggest that the Temple to which he went daily for prayer no longer contained the focus of earthly worship.

This does not of course mean that the doctrine of the new Naos was unknown at this period. The fact that St. Stephen made the use that he did of it is sufficient proof to the contrary; nor was there anything in the least inconsistent in the behaviour of the early Christians, when they continued to use the Hieron as their place of prayer. As we saw when we were discussing the passage 1 Kings viii. 14–53,[2] it was quite natural to think of the 'Temple' as a 'house of prayer', that is as a Hieron rather than as a Naos. Unless, indeed, a man were a priest, he had no *need* to think of it otherwise, since the sacrificial system was linked up primarily not with the 'heavenward' aspect of Jewish religion but with the belief in the Presence within the Naos. Even, therefore, when the Naos had lost its virtue, the courts and porches of the Hieron were still in the figurative sense the 'house of God'; and though an early Christian would necessarily avoid partaking in the sacrifices, he would still feel that he could find there a 'spiritual home'. It may well be that this is the distinction which St. Luke desires to indicate when he writes that while Christians 'continued stedfastly with one accord in the Hieron' they 'broke bread' at home. It was, in fact, a time of transition, when the Eucharist (which took the place of the old sacrifices)[3] was still celebrated in private

[1] Ps. cxviii. 22. The metaphor is taken from building in general, though it can of course be narrowed down to that of building the Naos. The associations of Ps. cxviii encourage this particularization, which is actually made in 1 Pet. ii. 4–7.

[2] See above, p. 73.

[3] See below, p. 204.

houses, while the Hieron continued to act as a meeting-place for 'common prayer'. The fact that St. Paul himself used the Hieron in this way, even when in his letters he was expounding the full doctrine of the new Naos, shows how easy it was for a Jewish Christian to persist in the 'old ways'; though it is scarcely surprising that the Jews from Asia, who would be well aware of his teaching, roused the multitude against him as one who taught 'all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place' (xxi. 27–8).

What then of St. Stephen? That an almost exactly similar charge should have been brought so long before this against the man to whose death Saul the Pharisee 'consented' must surely be counted a notable event in Sacred History: and when we find that this charge directly recalls the 'false witness' offered against Jesus Himself, it is obvious that this event demands the most careful examination. Let us note, then, in the first place two small but interesting pieces of indirect evidence which will serve to introduce St. Stephen's message. We are told, to begin with, immediately after the appointment of the Seven, that

> 'the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem exceedingly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.'
>
> (Acts vi. 7)

Is this mention of 'priests' (the only reference to them in Acts) entirely without bearing on what has just gone before? Surely not. The whole of this verse seems intended to describe the general effects which followed the solemn ordination of the Seven, of whom Stephen is clearly held to be the leader. It would not, then, be too rash to say that it implies a direct connexion

between his inspired teaching and the conversion of this 'great company' of men whose duties brought them into the most intimate relations with the Naos. How then was this conversion achieved? Certainly no Israelite priest could have been converted to Christ by being told merely that 'this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto us' (vi. 14)! He must have been assured (and this means that he must have been persuaded out of the Holy Scriptures) that the old Naos was passing away only because it was being fulfilled in the new and better one which had been predicted. Or, to put it in terms of the second part of the charge, he must have learned that the rites which had been intended to preserve Israel in holy communion with its God had now been superseded by one full perfect and sufficient Sacrifice in which all Israel, priests and people together, might from henceforth have their share, as a 'kingdom of priests' and a 'holy nation' (Exod. xix. 6) 'in Christ'.

So much for those priests whose hearts were not hardened to the word of God. Obviously on the other side there were many, not priests only but laymen, for whom the statement that the Temple was doomed to extinction would sound simply as open blasphemy. It is interesting to note that those of this persuasion whom St. Luke specially names were Jews of the Diaspora (Libyans,[1] Cyrenians, Alexandrians, Cilicians, and men of Asia), who had come to live in Jerusalem presumably in order that they might be able to attend the Temple-worship, and who having gone to all these pains would be the least willing to accept a gospel which declared that worship to be obsolete. But these

[1] This reading is to-day regarded as more probable than 'Libertines'.

were a small minority when compared with the fanatical multitude which formed the native population of Jerusalem, and which they found no difficulty in inciting against St. Stephen. Much has been written about his answer before his accusers, but it is necessary here to look at it from the special angle of our own inquiry, and we must therefore study it once again.

The speech begins significantly with a reference to the Glory, which would assure the audience that what they were to hear would be to the point. At the same time St. Stephen reminds them that the Glory of God was at no time pinned down to a single local habitation. When God first appeared to the great forefather of Israel it was far away in Mesopotamia. From that day onwards, moreover, he was continually on the move under the Divine direction. First God led him from Chaldaea to Haran, then He 'removed' him into the land of Canaan; and even there He 'gave him none inheritance, no, not so much as to set his foot on'. There, however, Abraham received the promise that his seed, after sojourning in bondage for four hundred years, would come to serve God 'in this place', and (as a pledge of this?) he was given the Covenant of Circumcision. [St. Stephen's argument seems to be on the same lines here as that of St. Paul in Gal. iii. 16–17: first, the Covenant, then 400 years afterwards the Law; the former irrevocable and pointing onwards to Christ, the latter a temporary dispensation which can be and has been superseded. This is thus an indirect answer to the charge that he has attacked 'the customs which Moses delivered'.]

So at every point the Divine Providence watched over the Patriarch and his seed. When Joseph's brethren

sold him out of jealousy into Egypt, God overruled their sin and made it a means of saving Israel from death by famine. When Moses' brethren forced him to flee into Midian, God used their ingratitude to bring their future deliverer to the Angel in the Bush, from whom he received his call. And yet what had been Israel's response? Not faithful obedience, as it was with Abraham, but disobedience rooted in self-will. When the man whom they had already once rejected appeared as their deliverer and led them out of Egypt with signs and wonders; when, even more than this, he held converse with the Angel of the Covenant in the thick darkness of Sinai and received 'living oracles' which were to make his people perfect in holiness, they thrust him from them once again, and worshipped and rejoiced in the works of their own hands. But this was only the beginning of their resistance to the Holy Spirit. Think next of the Tabernacle. [Here St. Stephen begins to deal with the charge that he has attacked the Temple.] The Tabernacle of the Testimony was not a mere man-made Sanctuary; it was built by Moses in accordance with 'the figure which he had seen' on the Mount (Exod. xxv. 40) and by the specific instructions of the Angel of the Covenant. It was thus God's work, not Israel's; and as such 'the fathers' brought it with them into the Promised Land, and with proper awe preserved it unaltered up to the time of David. Even David, indeed, never sought to make a substitute of his own for it; all he asked was to find a 'tabernacling-place' for the God of Jacob. It was left to Solomon to do what even his great father had not presumed to do, to build a *house* for the God who made the heavens and the earth!

The first thing that naturally strikes one about this denunciation of Solomon, and hence of the Temple itself, is its amazing courage. It is, of course, clear that a man who can speak thus is deliberately courting death: he is pleading guilty before a tribunal which was never likely to be moved in his favour. That is why, having made his point, he does not attempt to argue it, but hurries on to his climax. What Solomon did in his stiff-necked arrogance is what Israel has persistently done whenever it has found any messenger or ordinance of God unwelcome to its own ideas. He is accused himself of wanting to 'change the customs which Moses delivered', but what of the men who by betraying and murdering the Righteous One whose coming Moses foretold (vii. 37) have shown themselves incapable of obeying (not 'customs' merely but) the Divine Law itself! To such an attack there could hardly be more than one answer, and when St. Stephen acclaimed Jesus as 'standing on the right hand of God', he sealed his death. Whether his audience took this to refer to the 'Lord' of Ps. cx. 1 ('The Lord said unto my Lord', &c.) or to Wisdom 'that sitteth by thee on thy throne' (Wisdom ix. 4), they had no difficulty in grasping his thought, for there was only one Being who could be conceived of as so sharing the Glory of God—that very 'Angel of the Covenant' who had appeared to Moses in the Bush and on the Mount and who had 'tabernacled' thereafter amongst Israel in all the fulness of the Godhead. (It will be noticed that St. Luke makes this point clearer for his readers by actually mentioning the 'Glory' (vii. 55) in St. Stephen's vision, thus carrying their thoughts back to the opening words of the speech.)

It is, however, when we go back to St. Stephen's

reference to the Temple and reconstruct the argument which lies behind it that we realize the true courage and distinction of the man. That argument is based on the prophecy of Nathan to David (2 Sam. vii. 1–17) which we have already had several occasions to mention; and its stages are thus easy to follow. It may be convenient, however, if we tabulate the main heads of this passage:

1. David desires to build Jahweh a house of cedar like his own palace. (vii. 2.)
2. He is forbidden to do so, because Jahweh has always 'walked in a tent and in a tabernacle' and has never commanded any ruler of Israel to build him a house of cedar. (vii. 5–7.)
3. Jahweh, however, on his side will plant His People so that they 'be moved no more', and He will make a 'house' for David, setting up his seed after him and establishing [his] Kingdom. (vii. 10–12.)

[4. He shall build a 'house' for Jahweh's Name, and Jahweh will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. (vii. 13.)]

5. Jahweh will be [his] father, and he shall be His son, to be chastened if [he] commit iniquity but never to be utterly forsaken, as was Saul. (vii. 14–15.)
6. So David's house and kingdom will be made sure and his throne established for ever.

The verse and other words in square brackets are those which, as we have before indicated, were interpolated by some editor in order to justify Solomon's action in building a 'house of cedar'. In view of what Nathan had already said here, that act must appear precisely what it is judged by St. Stephen, an act of self-willed and stiff-necked arrogance; and this impression must at all costs be avoided. What! The Holy Temple a stand-

ing monument of disobedience! How shall such a thing be conceivable? What of the encouragement and the preparations which were said to have come from David himself, even to the point of his receiving 'by the spirit' the pattern of the whole Sanctuary and its furniture (1 Chron. xxii, xxviii)? What of the solemn dedication of the 'House' by Solomon? What of the centuries during which it was the focus of Israel's worship? In this conflict of Scripture with Scripture, and of Scripture with living experience, only one course was possible. Since the vision of Nathan could neither be ignored nor removed from the records, it must be harmonized, however awkwardly, with the facts of history. Jahweh had, after all, accepted the Temple as His 'Tabernacling-place': it could not therefore be said that Solomon had wantonly disobeyed him. And since it was only in this passage that there was even a suggestion that his action was wrong, it was only necessary to insert a few lines here to correct so unfortunate an impression.

The really extraordinary thing is that St. Stephen brushes all this sophistication aside and stands upon the straightforward sense of Nathan's message. He is not in the least overawed by the somewhat fulsome language in which the Chronicler belauds the Temple: it had been directly forbidden, and that is enough. But why had it been forbidden? With rare genius St. Stephen seizes upon the inner significance of the old 'Tabernacling' of Jahweh. A fixed 'house' implies a motionless God, motionless because not He but his worshippers will it so. But it is the God of Israel not His People whose Will is Law. It is He who moves, who guides and watches and succours, who finally plants His People so that it may 'be moved no more': and all through the

centuries the symbol of His unceasing vigilance has been a nomad's tent, 'resting' wherever and for whatever periods He pleased. Exchange this symbol for a 'house' built with hands, and what is the result? In the first place, the unique associations of the 'tabernacling' Presence immediately begin to lose their lustre: they grow pale in confinement. But worse than this, because a house is constructed of materials which man has made, not of the skins or the hair of animals which God has made, its own symbolism is from the first grossly defective and obscures the true nature of the 'Most High':

> The heaven is my throne,
> And the earth is the footstool of my feet:
> What manner of house will ye build me?
> saith the Lord:
> Or what is the place of my rest?
> Did not my hand make all these things?

St. Stephen, then, roundly condemns the Temple. Naos and Hieron together, it ought never to have been built, and the Jews had only to read their own Scriptures carefully to recognize this fact. But obviously that is not all that is in question here. We cannot possibly separate the charge of saying that 'this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place' (Acts vi. 14) from the similar charge brought against our Lord Himself:

> 'I will destroy this Naos that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands.' (Mark xiv. 58.)

The very fact that St. Stephen uses the same phrase 'made with hands' when speaking of the Temple of Solomon (vii. 48) makes this practically certain; but it is put beyond any doubt at all when we go back to the

prophecy of Nathan and read it, *with its interpolation*, as a Christian would have read it in the first century A.D. On this last point we have fortunately the clearest possible evidence, for the words of 2 Sam. vii. 14 are quoted by the writer of Hebrews in a passage which has long formed the liturgical Epistle for Christmas Day:

> I will be to him a Father,
> And he shall be to me a Son.

The inference here is obvious. As Jesus is the promised seed of Abraham (cf. Gal. iii. 16, &c.), so He is also the promised seed of David, whose kingdom shall be established for ever. It is He, then, not Solomon, of whom the (interpolated) verse (vii. 13) is made to speak; and since it says that He will 'build a house' for God's Name, this 'house' must necessarily be one 'not made with hands'. We must beware here of following the writer of Hebrews into his Idealist speculations (ix. 11), which we shall discuss separately,[1] but it is worth while noticing his treatment of this passage in his third chapter. He draws a contrast there between Moses who was faithful in all God's house as a servant and Jesus who as a son built the house and rules over it:

> Whose house are we if we hold fast our boldness
> And the glorying of our hope firm unto the end.
> (Heb. iii. 6.)

The word used here for 'build' (R. V. marg. 'established') is used also by this writer (ix. 2) of the Tabernacle; and the 'house' in which Moses was faithful for a testimony of those things which were afterward to be 'spoken' is thus clearly indicated. The first Tabernacle was 'built' by the Son, because Moses merely con-

[1] See Appendix, p. 287.

structed it in faithful obedience to the pattern which he had received from Him. What, then, of the second 'house' of which 'we' form a part? A phrase which appears to be strictly parallel to that already quoted will sufficiently describe it:

> 'For we are become partakers of Christ if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end.' (iii. 14)

Without going into further detail at this moment we may say that the writer of Hebrews uses the word 'house' ambiguously, or rather plays upon its double meaning of 'house' and 'household'; and since we find the same treatment of it in Eph. ii. 19–21, we may suppose that it was familiar to Christians, who no doubt took it over from this very passage of Samuel which we have been examining. Here our headings 1 and 2 have to do with a literal house of cedar, while in 3 the 'house' is figurative and represents the Davidic dynasty. In 4, on the other hand, the *original* meaning was again literal, for Solomon did actually build a 'house of cedar'; but when applied to Christ it could equally well be interpreted figuratively, as describing the new family or 'household' of God.

But must it not in any case be taken figuratively? Since the 'house' built by Jesus must be 'made without hands', does this not necessarily follow? Here, however, we must be careful to distinguish between the merely figurative and the symbolic. What the prophecy of Nathan requires, if it is to be fulfilled in Jesus, is that as Christ He shall do precisely that which neither Solomon nor any other ruler of Israel was allowed to do: He shall 'build' a 'Sanctuary' in which the Presence of God will 'tabernacle'. Now all these three terms are put

in inverted commas because all three are figurative, yet unless Jesus was able to create a new reality of which these terms are the recognized symbols, the prophecy loses its point; and we cannot imagine any Christian attaching the least importance to it. In other words, though it is undoubtedly possible to think of the Church as the 'household' of God without associating this idea with the language of Naomorphism, it is *not* possible to do this when we are interpreting 2 Sam. vii. 13 of Christ unless we want to make nonsense of the passage. *This* 'house' must and can only mean the Naos; and we are thus constrained to link what is said here of the 'seed' of David with what our Lord said (or may be presumed to have said) about the 'Naos of His Body'.

What appears, then, to have happened in the early Church was this. Our Lord's words about the new Naos which He was to raise up in three days were carefully treasured but not at first understood. Possibly He Himself had promised that their meaning would become clearer in course of time. In any case no mention was made of them in the first proclamation of the Gospel, nor was there any attempt to consider the bearing of them upon the still existing buildings of the Temple in Jerusalem. The Apostles themselves continued to go regularly to the Hieron, and the new 'sect' was thus left for the moment in peace. Suddenly, however, this peace was rudely disturbed, and all the available evidence points to St. Stephen as the cause. He had brought together these two explosive elements for the first time and the result was cataclysmal! On the one hand, it became clear to the Jewish authorities that, if the preaching of Jesus as the Christ led to these conclusions, the sect which followed Him must be

irreconcilably hostile to Judaism. This was no secondary offshoot like Essenism: it was a radical departure from the Covenant. Nay, it denied that Covenant; it declared its ordinances void and useless and its Sanctuary desolate; it wiped out Judaism as a living faith; in a word, it turned the world upside down. Small wonder that, on St. Stephen's death, there arose a 'great persecution against the Church which was in Jerusalem', or that a devout and ardent Pharisee like Saul of Tarsus should throw himself whole-heartedly into the task of exterminating the heresy!

On the other hand, the gain to the infant Church was at once enormous. The eloquence of St. Stephen had already effected the conversion of large numbers of priests, and now that Christians were 'scattered abroad' all over Palestine, great strides were made in another important but unexpected quarter, Samaria (viii. 1–25). It can hardly be doubted that as long as the Gospel was regarded as no more than a purified and enlightened form of Judaism, it was unlikely to have much success among the Samaritans. But the news that its followers were being persecuted because they denied the standing of the Temple in Jerusalem must have completely altered the situation. Some Samaritans at least must have remembered then the words of Jesus that the hour was coming when neither Gerizim nor Jerusalem would be the centre of true worship (John iv. 21); and when they heard Philip preaching the new mystery of the kingdom for which Stephen had died, and saw the Gift of the Indwelling Spirit conferred by the laying-on of the Apostles' hands, their remaining doubts must have vanished. Here was the faith for which unconsciously they had been longing, a faith brought to them by Jews

yet transcending the fundamental point of dispute which had for so long separated the two peoples. Here Jews and Samaritans could offer with one accord spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God, for in this 'Temple' of the Body of the Risen Christ there was now and from henceforth neither Samaritan nor Jew.

We have deliberately echoed here the phraseology of St. Paul for two reasons. In the first place we can only conjecture the terms in which St. Stephen would have expounded his teaching about the new Naos, when he was speaking about it to friends, not to accusers. We may suppose that his quick mind had long ago grasped the pregnant meaning of the Resurrection prophecy of Hosea. He must have realized that our Lord by repeatedly referring to this prophecy was predicting the constitution in Himself of a new collective Life of Holy Spirit. But when we ask ourselves how St. Stephen would have taught this truth in terms of Naomorphism, the data entirely fail us. We can only say from the evidence of the charge against him and of his own answer to it that he did actually so teach this mystery; and in suggesting the kind of language he may have used we fall back not unnaturally on the writings of the man who once consented to his death but lived to preach the same doctrine to the Gentiles. This suggests a second and weightier reason for introducing St. Paul at this point. For we may reasonably ask ourselves whether the doctrine of these two men was not most intimately related as cause and effect. Was not St. Paul's conversion, in fact, itself one of the most vital consequences of what must be called literally St. Stephen's 'martyrdom'? St. Stephen died, and drew down persecution upon the Church, because he 'bore

witness' to a truth which attacked Judaism at its centre. He affirmed that the God of Israel had rejected the Temple 'made with hands' and that in Jesus of Nazareth His People must now recognize the 'Lord' of a new Naos. It was this which must have seemed quite intolerable blasphemy to any deeply religious Israelite. It was one thing for Peter to speak before the Sanhedrin of God exalting Jesus 'with His right hand to be a Prince and Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins' (v. 31). This language was strange and daring, but though it made exaggerated claims for the Galilaean of Nazareth, it was still sufficiently ambiguous to escape the gravest censure. Had this not been so, St. Paul's own teacher Gamaliel would never have advocated a circumspect attitude of tolerance towards it (v. 34–9). But it was quite another matter when this Jesus was explicitly identified with the focal manifestation of the Godhead on earth. For this was an intrusion on the essential mystery of the Covenant-relationship. It was no mere talk of a man being 'divine', language which even the Psalmist was not afraid to use at times (Ps. lxxxii. 6; cf. John x. 34): it was the declaration that the Presence of Jahweh Himself had become incarnate, *with all that that implied.*

It was this which made Saul of Tarsus a persecutor of the Church. Like Gamaliel, he might have been prepared to tolerate the followers of Jesus if they had simply proclaimed their Master to be the true Davidic Messiah. That had been done before, and no doubt it would be done again: it was stupid and mistaken, but it was not blasphemous. But this was very different, for if *per impossibile* it were true it would mean the end of everything for a religious Jew. His cherished Temple-

worship (cherished even from Tarsus!), his sacred Law, his Holy Nation with its agelong traditions and proud aloofness, yes! and even his own inmost thoughts about God, all these—but why waste a moment in dwelling on this detestable, unthinkable prospect? To prison with these criminal lunatics! Onwards to Damascus! Against the conviction of such a living and ardent faith no argument, no demonstration from the Scriptures could be of any avail. But what if the Glory itself should be manifested on the Damascus Road? What if out of that blinding radiance, 'above the brightness of the sun', the Voice of the 'Lord' be heard as Moses once heard it from the Bush and from above the Mercy Seat? What if that Voice should destroy in a moment the whole edifice of these strong and deep convictions with its simple words, 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest'? Then Saul of Tarsus knows that Stephen spoke the truth. Something quite new and tremendous has taken place on earth, and out of its travail a new Israel, a new Covenant, a new Temple has been born. For the Lord has declared Himself from heaven, yet it is as one who but lately died and rose again as man. And in this Resurrection He so closely identifies Himself with those who have received His Name that He can say to their persecutor, 'why persecutest thou ME?'

> After two days will he revive us:
> On the third day he will raise us up,
> And we shall live before him.
> And let us know, let us follow on to know the Lord.
> (Hos. vi. 2–3)

So, thick and fast, new thoughts must have come crowding in upon one to whom the essential clue had at last been given. In the next chapter we shall consider

those of them which are most relevant to our present subject, and we shall see there how St. Paul 'followed on to know' His Lord. And yet if there is a progressive development to be noted in his preaching of the mystery of Christ, it is equally true that he found in Damascus, once and for all time, the eternal source from which all his later inspiration was to flow. For he knew then from the first whose Glory it was that had blinded him and

> Straightway in the synagogues he proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God.[1] (ix. 20)

[1] It may be remarked here that in the present writer's opinion it is hardly possible to accept as Pauline the speech recorded in Acts xiii. 16–41, with its reference to the Sonhood conferred *at* the Resurrection (verse 33. See below p. 247), not declared *through* it (Rom. i. 4). Note especially the references to the Resurrection-appearances (v. 31), and contrast this with St. Paul's own treatment of the subject (1 Cor. xv. 1–11). On the other hand, there is throughout a distinct echo of the previous Petrine addresses, and if these were not composed by St. Luke himself (in accordance with the convention of the day), the resemblance can scarcely be accidental. The simplest explanation would then be that it was St. Barnabas not St. Paul who was the speaker on this occasion, and that St. Luke (who was not present) made a slip through having wrongly assumed that St. Barnabas had already yielded the place of chief speaker to St. Paul. For St. Barnabas' early knowledge of the Apostles and their teaching see Acts iv. 35–7 and ix. 27.

Chapter IX

ST. PAUL

ONE of our great difficulties in following the thought of St. Paul is that we are not saturated, as he was, with the Old Testament. It may be well, therefore, to dwell on this point for a moment before we examine his teaching about the People and the Presence. To say that St. Paul's faith was controlled absolutely by the 'Scriptures' is almost a commonplace. This does not mean that he ignored the contributions of contemporary Jewish theology or that if he had found some aspect of truth in contemporary Hellenism he would have hesitated to use it. But it does mean that none of these things would have possessed any value for him except in the light of what God had revealed through the prophets. It was in the Old Testament and nowhere else that St. Paul found the explanation of the Person and work of Jesus Christ. This is the first point which must be kept in mind when we are studying his letters, and it has an obvious corollary. When St. Paul quotes his great authority, he is doing so with a knowledge of it immeasurably more intensive than any we ourselves possess. We have already been given in the beginning of St. Mark's Gospel an indication of this same difficulty. There, as we have seen, a few lines from two different prophecies are cited with the tacit expectation that the reader will know his Bible well enough to supply the rest for himself. The early Christian would do that as a matter of course, because he would know these portions of the Scripture by heart. We are in

much worse case, and have to remedy the defects of our education by patient and plodding research.

Whether St. Paul himself always expected such a knowledge from his readers we cannot tell, but the fact remains that we must continually miss the inner movements of his thought if we fail to follow up the less obvious of his citations from the Old Testament. Thus, to take one illustration, we may find ourselves puzzled by the passages which he quotes in Rom. xi. 26–7 as an assurance of the ultimate salvation of Israel:

(1) There shall come out of Zion[1] the Deliverer;
He shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:
And this is my Covenant unto them,
(2) When I shall take away their sins.

The first of these quotations is from Isa. lix. 20, and it is not immediately clear why St. Paul should have chosen it in preference to many other much more definite prophecies of the same event. But when we turn to the chapter in question we find that it is here that the prophet speaks of that wholesale sinfulness of Israel which forms the opening theme of the epistle (Isa. lix. 7–8; Rom. iii. 15–17).[2] The second quotation is from Isa. xxvii. 9, and it is even less obvious at first why this one line has been singled out. But again when we turn to the chapter we discover the reason. In part it is due to the Apostle's exhaustive familiarity with the Old Testament, for in the Greek translation the whole verse reads: 'For this the iniquity of Jacob shall be taken away, and

[1] The Hebrew reads 'to Zion', the Greek 'on account of Z'. St. Paul presumably quotes from yet another version, treating Zion as the new 'Jerusalem above'.

[2] St. Paul's familiarity with the Scriptures is seen here again in a small detail. The Greek of Isa. lix. 5 mentions 'asps' which explains the transition from Ps. cxl. 3 (Rom. iii. 13) to this passage.

this is the blessing on him, when I shall take away his sin.' But similarity of phrasing cannot be the only reason for the choice of this passage. St. Paul has been speaking of the gathering-in of the Gentiles, and now when he prophesies the return of 'all Israel' he is thinking of it not as a nation but as a collection of individuals:

> 'And ye shall be gathered one by one ye children of Israel.' (Isa. xxvii. 12)

Another instructive example of St. Paul's familiarity with, and use of, the Old Testament can be studied in Rom. ix. 25–9. In verse 27 he quotes Isa. x. 22–3 as foretelling that a remnant of the Old Israel will be saved. A little research shows that this particular passage has been chosen because it contains the expression 'as the sand of the sea'. These words are found in Hosea at the beginning of the verse of which St. Paul has just quoted the end (Hos. i. 10; Rom. ix. 26), but whereas in Isaiah they describe the greatness from which the Old Israel is to be reduced, in Hosea they depict the glory to which Israel is one day to be raised. But this glorified Israel with its 'one head' (i. 11) and its perfected Sonhood (i. 10) can be nothing else than the People which has been redeemed by, and incorporated in, Christ. Therefore St. Paul applies this prophecy (Hos. i. 10; ii. 23) without hesitation to the Church, i.e. *not* (as is so often affirmed) to the Gentiles alone but to 'us whom he also called, not from the Jews only but also from the Gentiles' (Rom. ix. 24). That, of course, is the character of the New Israel in which these two have been made one new man (Eph. ii. 15); but in the immediate context the point which St. Paul is concerned to make is that God has fulfilled His promise

in including in this New Israel that remnant of the Old which is 'according to the election of grace' (Rom. xi. 5).

With these illustrations of the working of St. Paul's thought before us we can now go on to examine what may be called the *locus classicus* of his teaching about the People and the Presence. This passage, which has already been mentioned in the Introduction, occurs in a context where it interrupts the argument, differing both in tone and in subject from that which precedes and follows it. It is therefore regarded with considerable justice as being a stray fragment from some other of St. Paul's letters. Perhaps, indeed, it is not altogether fanciful to suppose that it owes its preservation to the very fact that it is the Apostle's most definite exposition of this theme. It runs as follows:

> 'Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers: for what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity? or what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever? And what agreement hath the Naos[1] of God with idols, for we are the Naos of the living God: even as God said,
>
> (1) I will dwell in them,
> and walk in them;
> And I will be their God,
> and they shall be my people.
>
> Wherefore
>
> (2) Come ye out from among them,
> and be ye separate,
> Saith the Lord,
> And touch no unclean thing;
>
> (3) And I will receive you,

[1] Since there was and could be only one Naos of God, the translation of our English Versions 'a temple of God' is doubly misleading.

(4) And will be to you a Father,
And ye shall be to me sons and daughters,
Saith the Lord Almighty.[1]

Having therefore these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.'

(2 Cor. vi. 14—vii. 1)

The object of this exhortation is clear, though it is couched in general terms, reminiscent of Deut. xxii. 10 ('Thou shall not plow with an ox and an ass together'). It is to warn the Corinthians not to enter into any kind of association with non-Christians, because this is bound to endanger both their physical and their moral purity. First and foremost, however, this danger comes from the seduction of idol-worship, and St. Paul is therefore at pains to remind his converts that they have not simply been transferred from a heathen Hieron to one in which they can truly worship God, but that they *are* (not God's Hieron but) His Naos, the Holy Habitation in which He 'tabernacles' and walks on earth. But let us see how he develops his argument and examine at each stage the thoughts which constitute its background.

The first quotation from the Old Testament is a combination of Exod. xxix. 45 and Lev. xxvi. 12, and it is to be noted that in the former of these St. Paul retains the explicit verb 'tabernacle' in place of the paraphrase by which the Greek version seeks to escape the concreteness of the original Hebrew.[2] But in what sense does St. Paul

[1] i.e. 'Pantocrator', the Greek rendering of 'Jahweh Sabaoth'. The use of this title shows that the words are part of a citation from the Old Testament.

[2] 'To be called upon them and be their God.' Cf. Exod. xxv. 8, where the Greek replaces 'I will tabernacle' by 'I will appear among

regard this promise as having now (but only now) been fulfilled in Christ? As they stand, these words addressed by God to Moses in Exod. xxix find their ratification in Exod. xl. 34, when 'the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of Jahweh filled the tabernacle'. What other fulfilment, then, than this could be looked for? St. Paul's answer, put in its briefest form, is concentrated in a single preposition: God's promise to Moses was not simply that He would 'tabernacle' and walk *among* His People, but that He would 'tabernacle' and walk (move about the earth) *within* them. This statement, however, is of such importance that it must be studied in a wider context. We have to ask what was St. Paul's attitude to the whole history of the Old Israel and how (as an essential part of this) he envisaged the Person and work of Christ before the Incarnation.

The first of these questions need not detain us long, for St. Paul's position can be quite simply stated. We have already seen how all exilic and post-exilic prophecy foretold a new and glorious Age for Israel. This Age would be inaugurated by God Himself who would cleanse Israel from its sins, restoring to it that innocence which it had possessed in its early days in the Wilderness, and who after this cleansing would sanctify His People by His 'tabernacling' Presence in its midst and thenceforth for ever reign gloriously in Zion. Now this new Age, as St. Paul knew, had dawned with the coming of Christ. It was not yet complete, it had still to achieve its final consummation, when men would be freed entirely from the bondage of 'vanity' (Rom. viii. 18–25).

you'. Elsewhere, however, the Hebrew *shaken* is frequently rendered by the verbs *kataskēnoō* and *skēnoō* which convey the exact meaning of the original.

But it had begun, it was present here and now for all those who had been redeemed by Christ Jesus (Gal. i. 4). God in Christ had reconciled us to Himself (2 Cor. v. 18–19); He had cleansed us by the Blood of the Cross and sanctified us by the gift of His Indwelling Spirit (Rom. v. 9; Eph. i. 7; 1 Thess. iv. 3–8; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Cor. vi. 11): and by this act He had done more than establish a New Covenant of Communion with Himself (1 Cor. xi. 25; x. 16–21), He had wrought through the 'one Lord Jesus Christ' a New Creation (1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 17).

Thus 'the old things are passed away' and yet 'behold they are become new' (2 Cor. v. 17); and this applies with special force to the history of the Old Israel. The Age of Law mediated through Moses (Gal. iii. 19) has been done away, but that does not mean that the Scriptures of the Old Israel have lost their sacredness for Christians. On the contrary we must read them as having been 'written for our admonition' (1 Cor. x. 11) and 'comfort' (Rom. xv. 4), because they foreshadow the great Reality which is now come (Col. ii. 17). But more than this. Because this Reality is come and its mystery has been revealed to us (Rom. xvi. 25), we can find in the Old Testament the 'types' of which it is the true prototype. The New Age explains the Old, the New Start illuminates the first beginnings in the Wilderness. So we recognize, for example, in the Crossing of the Red Sea the baptism of Israel 'into Moses' (i.e. into the law) by water and the cloud, and in the provision of manna and of water from the Rock the spiritual Communion of God with His People: and so, in like manner, we can interpret all the ancient privileges of Israel. What was the tabernacle, whose pattern was given from

heaven (Exod. xxv. 9), but a pre-figuring of the true Sanctuary of the 'tabernacling' Presence?[1] What was the Glory (Rom. ix. 4) but the Shadow cast by the Presence, the reflection of that Image of God who is 'the Lord the Spirit' (2 Cor. iii. 18)? What was the Service of God (Rom. ix. 4), the old sacrificial worship, but the type of the living sacrifice, the 'spiritual service', which is to be presented to God by the Church in the new wholeness of its life 'in Christ' (Rom. xii. 1; vi. 4, 13; 1 Thess. v. 23; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 5)?[2]

It follows necessarily from this view of the Old Testament that while St. Paul regarded both the Cloud and the Glory as *in some sense* manifestations of the Divine Presence, he did not think of God's Power as *actively focused* in them. In this, it is not without interest to note, he approaches very nearly to the Targumists, though his fundamental position is, of course, totally different. In the Targums (Aramaic paraphrases) of the Old Testament[3] the Shekinah, the manifestation-form of the 'tabernacling' Presence, is not identical with the Glory of which it is the cause and which is simply its effulgence. Nor again is it intimately associated with the Cloud. Even in passages such as Exod. xxiv. 16–17, Num. ix. 17, 18, 22, x. 12 neither the mention of the Cloud nor the presence of the Hebrew verb *shaken* provokes any

[1] St. Paul does not himself mention the 'tabernacle', but this was obviously his view of it, as his teaching about the Naos implies.

[2] St. Paul has in mind the 'whole burnt-offering' (*kalil*), which for the Church means the dedication not merely of the body, nor merely of the thoughts, but of 'spirit and soul and body . . . entire, without blame' and 'without blemish' (1 Thess. v. 23; Eph. v. 27).

[3] For the following summary I am mainly indebted to articles in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* ('Memra', 'Shekinah'), *H. D. B.* ('Shekinah'), Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* ('Shechinah') and *Enc. Brit.* ('Logos'). For the Shekinah see above, pp. 112, n. 2, 138, n. 1.

reference to the Shekinah. But (as will be seen in a moment) the resemblance is even closer than this, for in the Targums it is not the localized Shekinah but the Memra, the almost hypostatized Word, which is regarded as the active representative of God on earth. This conception of the Word as God's agent has already met us.[1] It arises naturally from such passages as those already quoted (Isa. xlv. 22–4; lv. 10–11; Wisdom ix. 1–2, 8, 10) as well as from those in which the Word is spoken of as the creative principle (Ps. xxxiii. 6, cf. Gen. i. 3; Ecclus. xlii. 15; 2 Esdras vi. 38), the executor of Divine judgements (Hos. vi. 5), or the healer and deliverer (Ps. cvii. 20). This leads in due course to the association of the Word with the Divine Wisdom, already almost personified in the famous passage Prov. viii. 22 ff., and from this it is only a short step forward to the Memra of the Targums. In these the Word is definitely exalted over the Shekinah, as in the Targum (Jerus.) on Deut. xii. 5: 'The place which the Memra of Jahweh shall choose to place his Shekinah there.' This is very different from what we find in the Talmud and Midrash in which, perhaps in reaction to the explicit Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel, the Memra disappears and His functions are assigned to the Shekinah. In the Targums, on the other hand, the Memra is the active manifestation of the Divine Power. He comes to Israel as One sent from God (cf. Targ. Exod. xxv. 22, 'I will command my Memra to be there'). So He is present with Israel, aiding and accompanying it and performing wonders on its behalf (Targ. Num. xxiii. 21; Deut. i. 30; xxxiii. 3; Isa. lxiii. 14; Jer. xxx. 1; Hos. ix. 10, &c.).

[1] See above, pp. 135–6.

The resemblance of all this to St. Paul's thought is undeniably close. Christ is (not the Shekinah but) the Rock who accompanied Israel of whom Moses spoke in his song (1 Cor. x. 4; Deut. xxxii. 4, 18–30). But He is much more than this. He is the one Lord 'through whom are all things' (the first Creation), as also are 'we through Him' (the New Creation); for He is 'the image of the invisible God' in whom all things were created and hold together (1 Cor. vii. 6; Col. i. 15–17). St. Paul never actually calls Him the Word of God, but he would have undoubtedly used this terminology if it had suited his subject. As it is, his language both here and elsewhere (2 Cor. iii. 18; iv. 4) approximates very closely to that used about Wisdom in a well-known passage:

For she is a breath of the power of God
And a clear effluence of the glory of the Almighty; . . .
For she is an effulgence from everlasting light,
And an unspotted mirror of the working of God,
And an image of his goodness.

And she, being one, hath power to do all things
And remaining in herself, reneweth all things:
And from generation to generation passing into holy souls
She maketh men friends of God and prophets.
(Wisdom vii. 25–7)

St. Paul's familiarity with the Book of Wisdom, which is amply attested in the Epistle to the Romans, leaves us in little doubt that this was the source from which he borrowed the figures of the image and the mirror of glory. Indeed all that Wisdom, 'being one', is said here to be and to do is transferred by him in one context or another to the Person and work of the 'one Lord' Jesus Christ.

There is, of course, nothing strange in this resemblance between St. Paul and the Targumists, nor is it in the least necessary to go farther than the Hebrew Scriptures to discover the reason. Both were simply expounding conceptions which they found there in order to make the Bible more intelligible (or more acceptable) to readers of their own day. But here all resemblance ceases, and it is vitally important for us to grasp why, at the very point at which St. Paul seems nearest to this late Jewish theology, he is in reality at farthest remove from it. All through the history of the Old Israel we have seen a gradually increasing tension between two conceptions of Jahweh, the belief that He 'tabernacled' on earth in the midst of Israel and the 'natural' tendency to think of Him as enthroned in 'heaven'. And now, alike in Targum, Talmud, and Midrash, we witness the final victory of 'transcendent' religion. Now the thought of God has become so highly exalted that it is even dangerous to think of Him as dwelling in 'heaven'. So Isa. xxxiii. 5, 'He dwelleth on high', becomes in the Targum 'He has placed His Shekinah in the lofty heaven' (cf. Isa. xxxii. 15; xxxviii. 14). And this is not merely logical, it is in strict accordance with the Holy Scriptures, for 'the heaven of heavens cannot contain' Him (1 Kings viii. 27). So human reasoning is driven inexorably onwards. If logic and the Holy Scriptures together enforce this conclusion, which seems to remove God from any possible contact with His People, logic and the Holy Scriptures must together solve this difficulty. Now logic assumes that in spite of this conclusion there is, and must be, some communication between God and man. If, then, God Himself is too remote from sinful earth, He must establish this

communication by means of intermediary beings. All that now remains is to test this conclusion by the Scriptures, and we find at once in these the evidence we are hoping to find. Not only angels and archangels are plentifully present here to supply our need but other things, more mysterious and more divine, clear effluences of the glory of the Ineffable and Invisible Godhead. It was by these, by His Word, His Wisdom, His Shekinah, His Spirit, the Angel of His Covenant, the Angel in whom is the Name [the Metatron], that God in olden times held converse with Israel. Thus when we read that 'He' spoke or acted, we must not understand this literally. It was not He in the fulness of His Godhead who was present with His People: and what was impossible then is in the very nature of things impossible to all eternity.

It need hardly be said that St. Paul did not approach the problem in this way. Indeed he did not approach it at all, the problem came violently to him:

> 'For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ.'
>
> (Gal. i. 12)

That does not mean that St. Paul threw overboard all that he had learnt at the feet of Gamaliel. Like every other Jew he believed, and continued to believe after his conversion, that God, the Unbegotten Fount of Godhead, is invisible (Rom. i. 20; Col. i. 15; cf. 1 Tim. i. 17; vi. 16), and that the Law was 'ordained through angels' (Gal. iii. 19; cf. Acts vii. 53; Heb. ii. 2). But the Revelation which he received on the Damascus road held nothing which conflicted with these beliefs. What it

did for St. Paul was what Jesus had already done for His other eleven Apostles; it opened his mind that he might understand the Scriptures. We can, however, be much more explicit than this, for the very nature of the phenomena on the Damascus road turned the Apostle's thoughts irresistibly into one specific channel. He of all men, the champion of the Temple against St. Stephen's charges, had been permitted not only to behold the Glory but to hear the Voice (Num. vii. 89; Ezek. i. 25). And the Glory and the Voice were those of Jesus! For a moment St. Paul must have been as one stunned. What Stephen had said, then, was the literal truth, even though no such vision had been granted him. But if it were true, what a truth it was! What a gospel to be preached! What inexhaustible riches of glory this mystery, so long kept in silence, was now manifesting to the world! Every moment, as St. Paul read the familiar Scriptures over again in the light of this revelation, he felt a veil being lifted more and more rapidly from his mind (2 Cor. iii. 14). Passage after passage, prophecy after prophecy stood out not merely illuminated but transfigured now that he knew Jesus as the 'Lord' to whom he must turn (2 Cor. iii. 16). *That* decided everything. Not human reasoning, 'the wisdom of this Age', but 'God's wisdom in a mystery' (1 Cor. ii. 6–7), could alone bring light out of darkness, and it was just where the darkness of Scripture seemed most profound that St. Paul sought out 'with boldness' the deep things of God.

What then in substance is this Gospel, the outlines of which have already come into view; this Gospel which St. Paul could call 'his own' (Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25; Gal. i. 11; ii. 2), so certain was he that it was the special

charge committed to him? To reconstruct it is not a difficult task, for we have his letters to guide us: but it must be remembered that these in no case represent the Gospel as he preached it but are arguments, warnings, exhortations, instructions, written to make clear what in his judgement it implied. This being so, it is evident that we must build up our picture not merely from what St. Paul says but from the thoughts which he suggests and from the background which he expects his readers to supply for themselves. It is hardly necessary to repeat that these thoughts and this background have one place of origin only, the Holy Scriptures.

Let us return then once more to the passage which we set out to examine (2 Cor. vi. 14—vii. 1) and see what more it has to tell us. The second quotation from the Old Testament,

> Come ye out from among them,
> and be ye separate,
> And touch no unclean thing.

is derived from Isa. lii. 11. It occurs in the passage which begins with the famous words

> How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings,
> That publisheth peace,
> That bringeth good tidings of good,
> That publisheth salvation;
> That saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth.
>
> (lii. 7)

This is the opening note of St. Paul's gospel. The 'Lord' has 'returned to Zion' (lii. 8). He has 'made bare his holy arm' and 'all the ends of the earth' shall see his salvation (lii. 10). The New Age has dawned even as

the prophets foretold, and now all that they predicted of Israel is coming true.

But how has the Lord returned, and how has He wrought deliverance? We have only to read on to see. He has come 'in fashion as a man' and taking the form of the Servant (lii. 13 f.), has 'emptied out His life to death' (liii. 12; Phil. ii. 6–8), yea, the death of the Cross.[1] In perfect obedience to God He has 'made His grave with the wicked' (liii. 9). He has endured the death and submitted Himself to the tomb which was prepared for sinful Israel. Thus He has broken for ever the dominion of sin. He has borne the sin of many (liii. 12), taking upon Himself the curse which the Law pronounced against the whole People of God (Gal. iii. 13; Rom. iii. 19, &c.); and because for Israel's sake He has died the death of Israel, He has received the power to share with it the glory of His Resurrection. Now all that Hosea prophesied is being fulfilled (Hos. v. 15—vi. 3; i. 10–11, &c.). 'Born of the seed of David according to the flesh', the Lord Jesus has been 'declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead' (Rom. i. 3–4).[2] So the Righteous Servant 'justifies many', not only from the Jews but also from the Gentiles, since 'whosoever shall call upon the Name of the Lord shall be saved' (Joel ii. 32; Rom. x. 13). All, that is, who 'seek' the Risen Lord 'earnestly' may share His saving death through baptism and rise with Him to that newness of life in which there is no more bondage to sin (Rom. vi. 3–11: note specially 'He that hath died [Christ's death] is justified from sin').

[1] H. W. Robinson, *The Cross of the Servant*, p. 74.

[2] See above, p. 127 f.

So the New Age has come, and, as the prophets predicted,[1] it has begun by recapitulating the great events which long ago effected the deliverance of Israel and made it a Covenant People. But it has not been, what many Jews expected it to be, a simple repetition of these events 'according to the flesh': it has not meant deliverance from the dominion of Rome and the return of the Presence to the Temple made with hands. Nor again has it been what the apocalyptists dreamed of. There has been no catastrophic overthrow of the Gentile world, no appearance with clouds and glory of some mysterious semi-divine Son of Man. And though there has been a New Creation, it has not (as yet) been manifested as a new heaven and a new earth (Isa. lxv. 17). The New Age has come in neither of these ways: it has come 'according to the Spirit'. But what does this mean? It means that something has happened which no man could have foretold; something infinitely mysterious which not even the Holy Scriptures are able to reveal to us until they have been illuminated by the glory of the Gospel. It means that God has penetrated and transfigured His creature, man.

When we read the Scriptures in the light of this Revelation, they immediately yield up their secret, and we can see clearly how all the great events of the past have been recapitulated *in Spiritual Reality* 'in Christ'. God who is 'Spirit' has redeemed Israel who is 'flesh', and He has done this not in the external world of 'flesh' but in the inmost recesses of the 'flesh' itself. Therefore in Christ we see the true Passover who wins us deliverance (1 Cor. v. 7), and in our baptism into His Death we recognize our own triumphant Exodus (1 Cor. x. 2)

[1] See above, p. 104.

from 'this present evil Age' (Gal. i. 4). Now, too, we know the meaning of those prophecies which speak of the cleansing and hallowing of Israel after its escape from bondage.[1] First, the cleansing ('justification').[2] We have been washed (1 Cor. vi. 11; Eph. v. 26) 'with clean water' which God was to sprinkle on His People in the day that He should gather it out of all the countries (Ezek. xxxvi. 24–5); and we have received from Him the new heart and the new spirit which He has promised (ibid. 26) for we have been given the mind and spirit of Christ (1 Cor. ii. 12–15; Rom. viii. 9–11). Nor is this all the mystery. Because through baptism we were united with Him in His *Death* (Rom. vi. 1–5), His Blood effects for us that final purification which gives us free access to, and full communion with, God (Eph. ii. 13–18). For as the Body of Christ is the Naos in which the Godhead 'tabernacles', so He is the 'Mercy Seat', given us through His Blood (Rom. iii. 25), where God who dwells in Light unapproachable (1 Tim. vi. 16) yet meets with man (Exod. xxv. 22).

So the thought of purification ('justification'), the initial cleansing from defilement, merges imperceptibly into that of *Sanctification*, which is the eternal life of communion with God.[3] Herein lies the significance of the five words which St. Paul has taken for his third quotation in the passage which we are using as our framework:

'And I will receive you.' (Ezek. xx. 41)

This comes from the chapter in which the new Exodus and the new Wilderness Wandering are foretold, and it

[1] Ezek. xx. 35–42; xxxvi. 25–8; see above, pp. 91–2, 104–6.
[2] *Dikaiōsis* ("Up-righting").
[3] See above, pp. 91–2.

describes the final consummation of which these are the prelude. We have already quoted the passage in which it is found,[1] but it is important to study it again in its new context:

For in mine holy mountain
In the mountain of the height of Israel,
saith the Lord Jahweh,
There shall all the house of Israel, all of them,
Serve me in the land:
There will I accept them,
And there will I require your offerings,
And the first fruits of your oblations,
With all your holy things.
As a sweet savour will I accept you,
When I bring you out from the peoples,
And gather you out of the countries wherein ye have been scattered;
And I will be sanctified in you in the sight of the nations.
(Ezek. xx. 33–41)

How is this being fulfilled in the New Age of Spirit? It will make the answer clearer if we consider first what this prophecy would have meant if the New Age had been after all no more than another Age of 'flesh'. Then, without doubt, these words would have meant that God, having delivered Israel and cleansed it (in some unknown manner) from its sins, would have gathered it around His glorious Presence in the Temple, and there graciously accepted its offerings at His Altar. And this was in truth a wonderful and dazzling vision. How God would actually manifest His Presence in His Holy City only the future would disclose, but it meant at least that Zion would become the focus of the whole

[1] See above, p. 104.

world's worship and Israel its royal priesthood (cf. Isa. lxvi. 18–24; Zech. xiv. 16–21).

Yet the Reality, which has come not in 'flesh' but in 'Spirit', has utterly transcended these expectations, as St. Paul proceeds to show by his fourth quotation from the Scriptures:

> And I will be to you a Father
> And ye shall be to me sons and daughters,
> Saith the Lord Almighty.

These words, with one deliberate and significant change, are taken from the prophecy of Nathan which we have already analysed.[1] They convey to David the promise that though he may not himself build a Naos for the Presence (Name) of Jahweh, his 'seed' will one day do so:

> He shall build an house for my Name,
> And I will establish the throne of his
> kingdom for ever.
> I will be his Father,
> And he shall be my son.
>
> (1 Sam. vii. 13)

In the Reality of the New Age of Spirit, the true meaning of this prophecy is at last revealed. The promised 'Seed' is primarily Christ Himself, but this one seed has become in Him many 'sons and daughters'; and it is they who builded together in Him grow into the Holy Naos, the habitation of God in the Spirit (Eph. ii. 21–2).

This is the climax of St. Paul's gospel. Christ the Son of God, in whom as Risen and Exalted Man all the fulness of the Godhead 'tabernacles',[2] has won for us,

[1] 2 Sam. vii. 1–17. See above, pp. 158–63. The addition of the words 'Saith the Lord Almighty' from verse 8 is probably to make it clear that it is the Father who is speaking.

[2] See below, p. 223, n. 1.

His Redeemed, a double blessing. Sharing His Death and Resurrection, we have been adopted into His own Divine Sonhood; receiving His Spirit we have become that Naos which was to be raised up on the third day. That is the glory of our inheritance (Eph. i. 18) in its simplest and briefest form, but a much fuller account of it must be given if we are to understand all that it means and implies. To begin with, then, this twofold blessing is essentially one, because it is that mystery of the working of God's power (Eph. i. 19) by which Spirit descends through the Risen and Exalted Christ to overshadow, and 'tabernacle' in, our humanity (2 Cor. xii. 9; cf. Luke i. 35).[1] 'Spirit' for St. Paul as for St. John (John iv. 24) is simply another name for Godhead: it means the Being and Nature and Mutual Relationship of 'God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ'. Thus it is all one whether we say that God 'giveth his Spirit, his Holy Spirit, into us' (1 Thess. iv. 8) or that He 'has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts' (Gal. iv. 6). And when we say this, we are not speaking the 'typical' language of the Old Covenant but 'use great boldness of speech' (2 Cor. iii. 12): we are affirming that Godhead itself, not its mere transitory Glory, has entered into us. Hence, first of all, the Spirit is for us the Spirit of Sonhood. The Divine Being and Nature, the *life* (Rom. viii. 2; Col. iii. 4), of the Incarnate Lord is now ours. Not, indeed, that its complete fulness has yet been given, but we have received the first-fruits and earnest of it (Rom. viii. 23; 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5; Eph. i. 14). Even

[1] The R.V. translation 'spread a tabernacle over me' is more exact than A.V. 'rest upon me' but still misses the definiteness of St. Paul's language. He thinks of the power of Christ as the 'tabernacling' Glory which will overshadow him (the thought of the Cloud is implicit here, as in Luke i. 35) and will transform his weakness into strength.

now our life is in 'heaven' (Phil. iii. 20; Col. iii. 3); and while we wait for the Saviour who will finally conform us to His glory, we are even now being transformed in the Spirit, from glory to glory, into the image of Him who is Himself the image of the Father (2 Cor. iii. 18; iv. 4; Rom. viii. 29; Col. i. 15; iii. 10).

It would take us too far from our present purpose to dwell with St. Paul upon the joyful freedom which this Sonhood confers, and the yet more glorious freedom which the children of God will enjoy hereafter. What concerns us here is to relate this fact of Sonhood to the second aspect of the mystery which is being wrought in us by the Holy Spirit. As sons of God by adoption we are being transformed into the image of 'His own Son' (Rom. viii. 32), but *how* are we being transformed? The answer is that we are being progressively sanctified. Here we begin to touch the heart of the mystery of At-one-ment, the consummation long ago foretold in the Holy Scriptures:

My tabernacle also shall be with them;
And I will be their God,
And they shall be my people.
And the nations shall know that I Jahweh do sanctify Israel
When my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore. (Ezek. xxxvii. 27–8)[1]

This is the end of our Election. We have been 'sanctified in Christ Jesus' (1 Cor. i. 2), 'called to be saints' (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2), chosen by God 'from the beginning unto salvation in sanctification of Spirit' (2 Thess. ii. 13). In one sense this 'Sanctification' was effected once for all by the Blood of the Cross. To have been

[1] See above, pp. 91–2.

washed, sanctified, justified, means the same thing (1 Cor. vi. 11); since we are now 'in Christ Jesus, who was made unto us . . . both righteousness and sanctification and redemption' (1 Cor. i. 30). But, just because we are now *in* Christ Jesus, the word 'sanctification' has a further and deeper significance: it describes the purpose and goal of that which was wrought by His Death and Resurrection and imparted to us by our Baptism '*into* Him'. Christ died that He might reconcile us to God; that is our Redemption, our 'Justification'. But Reconciliation was itself but a means to a greater end, an 'indispensable preliminary'[1] to a greater Consummation. Christ gave Himself up for us that having cleansed us by the washing of water in the word He might sanctify us, to present us holy and without blemish and unreprovable before God (Eph. v. 26–7; Col. i. 22).

Thus the Spirit of Sonhood which we have received is at the same time the Spirit of Holiness (Rom. i. 4), Holy Spirit. This is the second aspect of the mystery of At-one-ment, and it has itself two sides which we must study in turn. First, however, we have to note St. Paul's use of the sacrificial term 'without blemish', for this identifies his whole line of thought on the subject. 'Without blemish (*amōmos*)' is the word almost invariably used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew *tamim* (perfect) of the Priestly Code: it refers, of course, to the primary condition without which no animal victim could be acceptable to God. St. Paul's choice of this term is therefore extremely significant. It shows in the first place that the idea of Holiness is for him inseparably connected with the idea of worship, the focal point of

[1] See above, p. 93.

communion between God and man. But it shows more than this. When St. Paul uses this language he is not speaking figuratively, as though it were now possible to think of worship as 'purely spiritual'. Rather he is proclaiming the fulfilment, in actual concrete Reality of Spirit, of that eucharistic offering which Israel had been promised but had never yet achieved.

Holiness is, in other words, bound up in St. Paul's mind with the thought of the 'tabernacling' Presence. These two belong to one another, and the best clue to understanding what he has to say about them is to be found accordingly in the Old Testament:

> 'Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy: for I am Jahweh your God. And ye shall keep my statutes and do them: I am Jahweh which sanctify you.'
>
> (Lev. xx. 7–8)[1]

Here we have the two sides of Sanctification plainly stated, first the command to Israel, then the reminder that God 'gives what He commands'.

(i) '*Sanctify yourselves.*' We have seen in our discussion of the work of the Priestly writers that while this idea of 'Holiness' necessarily implied moral obedience to the Law it actually applied to the whole psycho-physical being of the Israelite.[2] St. Paul is very insistent upon this truth, when he speaks of Christian sanctification. The self which is to be made holy is not a 'spiritual' entity but a body (or as we should say an organism)[3] which has been built into the Naos of the Holy Spirit

[1] Cf. Lev. xi. 44 (1 Pet. i. 16) 'Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy, for I am holy'.

[2] See above, pp. 107–8.

[3] In Hebrew thought 'the physical organism *was* the man and the bodily organs were the active agents of experience' (Fosdick, 'A Guide to understanding the Bible', *S. C. M.*, 1938, p. 84).

(1 Cor. vi. 15, 17, 19). Now the Consummation has arrived, which was promised:

I will require your offerings,
  and the firstfruits of your oblation,
  with all your holy things.
As a sweet savour [of sacrifice]
    will I accept you. . . .
And I will be sanctified in you in the sight of the nations.

But now also this Consummation is found far to exceed anything that could have been looked for. We who are commanded to 'come out from among [the heathen] and be separate and touch no unclean thing'[1] not only 'carry the vessels of the Lord'[2] but are ourselves the Sanctuary of His Presence. 'Having therefore (received) these promises', so marvellously fulfilled, it is for us to present the one offering which the Lord requires and accepts: 'let us cleanse ourselves from *all* defilement of flesh and spirit, *perfecting* holiness in the fear of God' (2 Cor. vii. 1).

Two further passages may be quoted which will make clear St. Paul's conception of this 'perfect holiness' and at the same time lead us on naturally to the sanctifying work of the Spirit Himself. The first deals mainly with the 'defilement of the flesh':

> 'For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye abstain from fornication; that each one of you know how to possess himself of his own vessel[3] in sanctification and honour, not in the passion of lust . . .; that no man set at nought and overreach his brother in the matter. . . . For God called us not for uncleanness but in sanctification. Therefore he that rejecteth, rejecteth

[1] Isa. lii. 11 (see above, p. 182).
[2] Isa. lii. 11.
[3] i.e. his own wife.

not man but God, who giveth His Spirit, His Holy Spirit, unto you. (1 Thess. iv. 3–8)

The subject of this passage is fornication, to St. Paul the most flagrant example of flesh-defilement, of which he says that while *all* sins are committed 'from the body outwards' (cf. Matt. xv. 18–20), *this* is committed by a man 'into his own body' (1 Cor. vi. 18). And yet even here, as he points out, there is also a defilement of the spirit; for there is not merely a passion of lust but a passion of arrogance which denies and sets itself above the rights of others.[1] Elsewhere St. Paul describes in vivid and striking language this second deeper defilement (Rom. vii. 7–25). The passage is so well known that it need not be quoted in full, but there is one very significant point about it which is generally overlooked. When St. Paul wishes to present Sin in its blackest horror, he pictures it as a blasphemous parody of the 'tabernacling' Spirit:

> But if what I would not, that I do, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.
> (Rom. vii. 20)

That, he would have us realize, is the condition of the human organism ('this body of death') in the Age of 'Flesh' (vii. 18–24); and it is from this defilement above all that we need sanctification. Thank God that we have received in Christ the new will and the new power by which that is made possible:

> I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, well-pleasing to God, which is your spiritual worship. And be

[1] This double defilement is stated more specifically in the catalogue of the works of the 'flesh' (Gal. v. 19–21), and it is noteworthy that its second side is more strongly emphasized than its first.

not fashioned according to this Age: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the will of God, even the thing which is good and well-pleasing and perfect. For I say, through the grace that was given me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but so to think as to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to each man a measure of faith.

For even as we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office: so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another. (Rom. xii. 1–5)

Once more the sacrificial note is sounded, and Christians are reminded what that 'perfect'[1] offering is which God requires and accepts from them in Christ Jesus.

(ii) We have reached a point here at which it becomes imperative to turn from the human to the Divine side of our sanctification. We might, of course, have begun with this, but have preferred to follow the Pauline order:

Work out your own salvation in fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure. (Phil. ii. 12–13)

Now, however, that we have penetrated with the Apostle to the very roots of the mystery of evil there is no room in our thoughts for anything but 'the mercies of God'. *I am* JAHWEH *which sanctify you.* It is God 'which worketh in us'. But it is Jesus, to whom He has given the 'Name that is above every name' (Phil. ii. 9), through whom He fashions His New Creation

[1] The same Greek word is used to translate *tamim* in Exod. xii. 5 (the Passover).

according to that working of the strength of his might which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this Age, but also in that which is to come: and he put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all. (Eph. i. 19–23)

The Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians is sometimes challenged on the ground of its 'advanced theology of the Church'. We have seen, however, that this theology is implicit in a gospel which is based four-square upon the Old Testament, and that it becomes explicit when once the crucial prophecy of Hos. vi. 2 has found its true interpretation in Christ. We have seen, moreover, that our Lord Himself must not only have applied this prophecy to His Resurrection but have combined with it the even more mysterious promise of a Naos not made with hands.[1] We have seen, finally, that St. Paul's teaching about the Resurrection and the new life in Christ is simply an exposition of this twofold theme.[2] It is, of course, possible that St. Paul did not at once perceive the full significance of his own gospel; but as his missionary experience widened, the very failings of his converts must have forced home upon him the true meaning of the grace which they misused. They had 'put on Christ' (Gal. iii. 27);[3] yet their self-centred

[1] See above, pp. 140–4 f.

[2] See above, pp. 127–8 f.

[3] Though there are weighty objections to the view that Galatians is the earliest of St. Paul's letters, it certainly *assumes* teaching which St. Paul gave on his first missionary journey. This very strong expression shows therefore that he taught from the first the mystery of the collective Body of the Risen Christ.

individualism constantly provoked the challenge, Is Christ divided? (1 Cor. i. 13). It was against a background of 'enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, heresies, envyings' (Gal. v. 20–1, cf. 1 Cor. iii. 3; xi. 18–19; Rom. xiii. 13; Phil. ii. 3–4), of 'bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and railing', of malice and falsehood and theft (Eph. iv. 25–31, cf. Col. iii. 8–9) that the mystery of At-one-ment stood most clearly revealed. Where Sin had abounded, Grace did abound more exceedingly (Rom. v. 20). Where Sin had dwelt in the depths of 'fleshly' selfhood, sundering man from man, and male from female, Jew from Gentile, Greek from barbarian, slave from master, there God had shed abroad His Love through the Holy Spirit, making all men in Christ Jesus one new being (Rom. v. 5; Gal. iii. 23; Col. iii. 10–11; Eph. ii. 15).

St. Paul never actually says that God is Love (1 John iv. 8, 16), just as he never actually says that God is Spirit, but he proclaims this truth by direct inference with every word that he writes about the 'tabernacling' Presence. The Holy Spirit who dwells in us as His Naos is the Holiness of God Himself; and this Holiness, this fulness of Godhead, has been manifested to us in the mind of Christ Jesus whose Spirit He also is. In Christ, the Image of the Father, we see both what Godhead is and what Godhead 'tabernacling' within us wills and works for His good pleasure. And what we see is Love: Love in Jesus, self-emptying, self-denying, self-surrendering to the death of the Cross; Love in ourselves working that same miracle that we may be

> of the same mind, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind; doing nothing through faction or vainglory, but in lowliness of mind each counting other

> better than himself; not looking each of [us] to his own things, but each of [us] also to the things of others.
>
> (Phil. ii. 2–4)

This is the 'fellowship of the Spirit' (Phil. ii. 1); and its keynote, as St. Paul so constantly insists, is One-ness: it is, in fact, both the seal and the dispensation of that perfect At-one-ment which is being fulfilled, all in all, in Christ (Eph. i. 10, 13, 23). What, then, is this At-one-ment? First, it is the At-one-ment of God with man. Through the one Lord, Jesus Christ, we have our access in the one Spirit to the one Father 'of whom are all things, and we unto Him' (Eph. ii. 18; 1 Cor. viii. 6). And this 'access' is not merely that of worshippers for whom the old barriers of the Hieron-courts have been broken down and who have even passed through the Veil into the Most Holy Place of the Naos: it is a communion so intimate that we ourselves enfold the Presence, and as the living stones of His habitation are radiant with His Glory (Eph. ii. 15, 21–2; 2 Cor. iii. 18, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 4–5). But this Glory of the Godhead is Love: therefore the At-one-ment of God with man not only implies but indispensably requires the At-one-ment, through this same Glory, of man with man. This is a vital truth, to which we shall return later. There can be no At-one-ment of man with man except in the fellowship of the Naos which is the 'tabernacle' of the Divine Love: and there can be no At-one-ment of God with man except in man's offering of his selfhood in Christ to the building up of that Naos in Love. That is why we are to work out our salvation 'with fear and trembling' even while we know that it is God 'which worketh in us'.

What, then, is Love, and how are its operations con-

trolled and guided? St. Paul does not answer this like St. John by carrying us first into the inmost heart of the Godhead. He may have done so when he was preaching his gospel; but his letters, even when he is writing of 'mysteries', have earthly needs and human frailties in view. What concerns him chiefly is to make his readers understand first the real nature of Sin and then the full glory of their Redemption in Christ. Of his diagnosis of the former we have already spoken. With the genius of Inspiration St. Paul finds the root of all human evil in the self-centredness of the individual 'I': it is from this basic perversion and profanation of selfhood that all those tyrannous passions have arisen which distract and divide mankind. But in Christ this broken unity of mankind is restored. Through the new life, His own Risen Life, which He gives to those who are baptized into Him, He imparts a Unity which at once transcends and reconciles all the innumerable differences of innumerable individual selves. We may call this Unity the Unity of the new 'Israel of God' (Gal. vi. 16); or we may call it the Unity of His Naos or the Unity of the Body of Christ. For all these three are one and the same. Christ is the perfected Israel in whom we rise again 'the third day'; and it is His Body crucified, risen, and exalted which is the Holy Naos of God. (So St. Paul can speak almost in the same breath of the 'commonwealth of Israel', the 'household of God' which is also the Naos that 'grows', and the Body of Christ which is 'builded up'.) But whichever of these terms we use, the essential point is that this Unity comes to us from above, and that we are what we are through submitting our separate selves to its conformation and in that sense losing them. *The individual henceforth disappears: he has*

become a part or a member of the Naos-Body: 'it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me' (Gal. ii. 20).

It may be well to stress St. Paul's insistence upon this truth. He does not say, as readers unfamiliar with the subject usually assume, that we are '*temples*' of the Holy Spirit, so that the Holy Spirit dwells within each one of us separately and independently. What he says (1 Cor. iii. 16) is that we are (together) the Naos (there can only be one) of the 'tabernacling' Presence with the implication that the Holy Spirit dwells in us[1] in virtue of our being built into the structure and 'fitly framed' to our particular allotted place in it (Eph. ii. 21). It is the Naos which comes first, perfect already in its form because it is the Body of Christ, and yet, because it is that Body given for us, growing into a new fulness, the church of the saints (Eph. i. 23). Then it is that we enter upon our heritage, no longer our own but surrendered to God for His building (1 Cor. vi. 19; iii. 9), knowing only that if we remain rooted and founded in Love we shall receive through faith the vision of the Naos that is to be (Eph. iii. 17–19, cf. Ezek. xl. 3–4; Zech. ii. 1–2). No doubt this language sounds to us to-day too strange and 'mystical' to be edifying, and though there is an unconscious irony in saying this (since 'edifying' means simply 'building up'), it is certainly just at this point that St. Paul himself passes naturally to the thought of the Body. We may say 'passes' with some assurance, for this must have been the order in his own mind. What he says about the

[1] Cf. Acts ii. 3, 'There appeared unto them tongues parting asunder like as of fire; and *it* sat upon each of them'. So centuries before the heretic Pharaoh Akhenaton had depicted the solar disk with rays ending with human hands, which rested severally upon the king and members of his family and court.

Naos is based upon the revelation of the Holy Scriptures; what he says about the Body came to him 'through revelation of Jesus Christ' (Gal. i. 12). The meaning of this may not be at first evident to us with our modern outlook, so a word must be said about it. The Jew, nurtured on the Old Testament, thought naturally of Israel as a collective Whole; for although individual responsibility was taught clearly by Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the old sense of national solidarity always held the field. Once again the Jew, studying the writings of the prophets, thought naturally of the destiny of Israel as inseparably connected with the return of the 'tabernacling' Presence. Thus the future of the Naos stood very close to the future of the collective Israel, and when these two were found to meet and merge in Christ, the 'Lord' of the Naos, this thought, however bewildering theologically, would have presented no insuperable difficulty to the imagination.

But the Naos is also the crucified and risen Body of the Saviour. It must be thought of, then, not merely as a static structural Whole but as a living and growing Whole with all that that implies. Here it is that the new revelation enters, opening out a vista of thought inexhaustible in its significance. All that can be said of the designed coherence of the parts of a structural Whole is as nothing when we see in this Whole the mystery of a living organism. Then 'coherence' becomes too pale an expression to be of service to us. What we see in a living body is far more than this: it is the active and devoted interplay of mutual self-giving and co-operation by which the 'many members' serve in one fellowship the interests of a Whole which itself transcends them. The full implications of this great truth

must be reserved for discussion below, when we consider what has been called the principle of 'Holism'. What concerns us here is the simple fact that it was St. Paul who first applied this truth to the Body of Christ and called it by its new name, Agapē, Love. Agapē is not love in a vague and general sense, it is the Love of God working within, and consolidating, the Fellowship of the Body of His Son. The Body comes first; it is the Given Whole, with its own laws of being, its own principles of organization, its own apportionment of gifts and offices to the members who are incorporated into it (Rom. xii. 4–8; 1 Cor. xii. 4–30). And the Spirit of the Body is Agapē, knitting the members together through lowliness and meekness, long-suffering, forbearance, tender-heartedness, forgivingness (Eph. iv. 2–32). So God sanctifies man (not merely men) from within. A New Creation rises, manifesting in the oneness of its multiplicity the 'fruit' of that Presence who permeates it with His Glory (Gal. v. 22). And as it offers continually the fruit which is the 'firstfruits of its oblations', the one eucharistic sacrifice acceptable to God, so also it grows continually, through the Love which is working in it, towards 'the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ' (Eph. iv. 13). Nor is this the end. Beyond the consummation of this At-one-ment of humanity through and in and into God, St. Paul descries an even grander and vaster consummation, of which the Church itself is but the first-fruits. For as the Love of God embraces all creation, so must all creation one day feel the power of its working from within, till the Glorious Presence shall have made the universe His Naos, the Holy Unity of all things summed up in Christ (Rom. viii. 19–23; Eph. i. 9–10).

Here for the moment we may leave St. Paul, postponing till a later stage our consideration of his teaching on the Sacraments and Ministry of the Church. What immediately interests us is the mystery of the At-one-ment itself, of which these are but the outward and visible signs, and we must conclude our study of it by turning to that other great expounder of the grace of the 'tabernacling' Presence, who bears traditionally the name of John.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON ST. PAUL'S NAOMORPHISM

In the foregoing account of St. Paul's teaching no mention has been made of one Naomorphic reference which may seem to present a difficulty. This is the passage in Eph. ii. 20–2 in which, after naming the apostles and prophets (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 28) as the foundations of the new Naos, St. Paul describes Christ Himself as being its 'chief corner stone'. At first sight this would appear to make Christ a part of the new Whole which has come into being through His Death and Resurrection; but a comparison of this passage with Eph. iv. 15–16 and Col. ii. 19 will show what is really in St. Paul's mind. Christ is at once the Whole transcendent to its parts (1 Cor. xii. 12; cf. John xv. 5) and the Co-ordinator and Integrator of those parts in the multiplicity of their natures and functions. This latter thought is what St. Paul is expressing when he speaks of Christ as the Head of the Body (see references above). In strict accuracy the head is only a part of the body and as such is not in absolute control of all its activities; but that does not prevent us from speaking of the 'head' of an organization and knowing quite well what we mean. The Headship of Christ over His Church is, of course, something much greater and more wonderful than this; it is a mystery which can even be described as a bridal

union (Eph. v. 22–33): but when we wish to think of our Lord as the Centre from and in whom we are 'knit together', no better terminology is available than that of the head and the other members of a body. Now it is precisely of this co-ordination and integration of 'living stones' (1 Pet. ii. 4–6) that St. Paul is speaking in Eph. ii. 21 ('fitly framed together'), and it is in this sense that we must interpret the 'chief corner stone'. In an earlier Naomorphic passage he describes Christ (not the apostles and prophets) as the foundation; here he thinks of Him rather as that which draws the Naos together into a united Whole. The thought in both cases is not an easy one, and indeed it tends to lose its force if we press it too far: but this is simply because the living and 'growing' Church (Eph. ii. 21) cannot be described adequately in terms of a static architectural structure.

But the Church *is* truly the Naos. Indwelt by Christ through the Spirit of Love and securely rooted and founded, it is the Temple whose breadth and length and height are known to God and will one day be known to all His saints (Eph. iii. 17–18; cf. Ezek. xl. 2–4). The keynote of the Christian life of fellowship is 'building up' (Rom. xiv. 19–20; xv. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 1; x. 23; xiv. 3, 4, 5, 12, 17, 26; 2 Cor. x. 8; xii. 19; xiii. 10; Eph. iv. 12, 16, 29; Col. ii. 6–7; 1 Thess. v. 11): and this must not be taken in a purely vague and general sense. Naomorphism in fact is an essential and vital element in St. Paul's gospel. Not merely does it express in the language of the Bible the Consummation which the prophets predicted, but it is a continual reminder of what is meant by the Church's Sanctification. We have boldness and access in confidence through Christ in one Spirit unto the Father (Eph. ii. 18; iii. 12; Rom. v. 2); but this does not mean that we may appear before Him with careless levity, as if our freedom had diminished aught of His awful Holiness. We come as those who are perfecting holiness in the fear of God (2 Cor. vii. 1) to present our bodies a living,

holy, and acceptable sacrifice (Rom. xii. 1). It is the thought of the Church as the Naos which confronts us with the reality of our priesthood. We have inherited through Christ the hierurgical service which was once one of the privileges of the Old Israel (Rom. ix. 4; xii. 1): and this ministry is not merely the offering up of ourselves in the Eucharist which is man's highest act of adoration; it is a 'ministering of the gospel' that the offering up of the Gentiles may also be made acceptable to God, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit (Rom. xv. 16). St. Paul never actually uses the term 'priesthood', but his thought is throughout entirely in line with that of 1 Pet. ii. 4, 9–10, which explicitly echoes Exod. xix. 6. When he speaks of our growth in Love, he passes naturally to the thought of our 'organismal' life in Christ, but he will never allow us to forget that this Love is the fulness of Godhead (Col. ii. 9); and that we are His Tabernacle, manifesting and ministering among men the glorious mystery of the At-one-ment (2 Cor. v. 18; Eph. iv. 12).

Chapter X

ST. JOHN

WHO was the author of the Fourth Gospel? This question, so long, so learnedly, and to all appearances so exhaustively argued, might well appear to defy further investigation. Nevertheless there are certain indications which to the writer seem to have been strangely neglected, and we may begin our inquiry by passing these briefly in review.

We may assume first of all, what is now very widely if not universally admitted, that the author was both a Jew and a Palestinian Jew: the evidence for this seems to be so overwhelming that it need not be recapitulated. That he was also one of our Lord's disciples is a fact which is implicitly acknowledged in the main body of the Gospel and explicitly stated in the appended chapter xxi: he was 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' (John xiii. 23; xix. 26; xx. 2; xxi. 7, 20). *But this same evidence shows that he was not one of the Twelve.* We may infer this in the first place from the title itself, for in spite of all arguments to the contrary[1] it is impossible to regard it as anything but a mark of distinction. What indeed was the purpose of using it in the first of these passages except to explain why *this* disciple reclined in Jesus' bosom? And since it is used for this purpose in this context, it can only mean that while Jesus loved—as of course we know He did—all His disciples equally, He felt for this particular disciple a more particular kind of

[1] Westcott's reasoning is here extremely strained. He appears to overlook the strength of the case against him (*The Gospel of St. John*, pp. xxii–xxiv).

affection.[1] Now it would be untrue to say that our Lord made no sort of distinction among the Twelve, for He chose Peter, James, and John on three occasions to witness events from which the rest were excluded; and of these three He gave St. Peter a position of special primacy. But it is nowhere stated that He viewed any or all three of these disciples with a more particular affection than the others, and even if He had done so inwardly (of which of course there is no shadow of evidence) it is inconceivable that He should have expressed this affection by an overt act of favouritism. It follows that whatever distinguished *this* disciple (what it was we shall consider in a moment) distinguished and set him apart from, but evidently not above, *all* the Twelve.

This conclusion is corroborated by a second piece of evidence. In the last scene recorded in the Fourth Gospel we are told that St. Peter, seeing this disciple following Jesus, asked, 'Lord what shall this one do?' (literally, 'Lord, this one what?'). Why does St. Peter think it necessary to ask this question? He is himself an apostle, i.e. 'one who is sent out'; and he has just received his second call to apostleship, a thrice-repeated call special to himself because he has thrice denied his Lord. But if the other disciple is one of the Twelve and more than that, one of the chosen Three, as some would have us believe, how is it possible for St. Peter to doubt what 'this one' is to do? And yet, as we know, St. Peter had good reason to ask this question. For this disciple had been definitely debarred from apostleship by our

[1] The distinction made by Westcott between the two Greek words *agapē* and *philia* loses much of its force in the light of this obvious inference. Did St. John in fact distinguish these two so precisely? He at any rate uses the latter once of the Father's love for the Son (v. 20).

Lord Himself: he had been given instead the charge of the Virgin Mother; and this did not mean 'leading her about' on his journeys as the Apostles did their wives (1 Cor. ix. 5), but caring for her in his own home (John xix. 27). But if then he was not to follow Jesus on the path of apostleship and death (xxi. 18–19), what then? Our Lord's answer, though ambiguous, makes it clear that his work, whatever it would be, lay wholly outside that pastoral charge which He had just committed to St. Peter: 'If I will that he abide till I come, what is that to thee. Follow *thou* me.'

But what could it have been which distinguished this disciple from the Twelve, so that our Lord could display a special affection for him which yet did not in any way set him *above* the Twelve? The answer must surely be his age. If this disciple was very much younger than the Twelve, if in fact he was still little more than a boy, then our difficulty is solved. The affection then which our Lord both felt and could express without any suspicion of favouritism was simply the love of an elder brother for the 'baby' of the family, the love of a Joseph for a Benjamin; and the younger the lad was, the more closely Jesus would keep him to His own side. And this perfectly simple explanation explains a good deal more. It throws a new light on our Lord's charge from the Cross, 'Woman behold thy son . . . Behold thy mother', for it shows that while the disciple was old enough to look after our Lady, he was still young enough to need her care and love. But it does more than this, for it explains what must always be a puzzle to the reader, how this disciple could enter the High Priest's residence without fear of arrest and even induce the portress to admit St. Peter (xviii. 15–16). He was

known, it is true, to the High Priest, but it must be equally true that he was also known to be a follower of Jesus; and it is extremely unlikely (to say the least) that he could reckon on old acquaintance, when all the rest of the disciples were 'in fear of the Jews' (xx. 19). But the case is wholly altered if he was himself scarcely more than a boy who had had the 'run of the house' ever since he could walk, for then he would be 'Master John' to the servants, who had 'got mixed up with this business but would forget all about it when he grew up'. With a full-grown man like this fellow he had just let in it was a very different matter; if *he* was one of the group, he must be arrested at once: it might in fact be a very good lesson to the boy to leave such things alone in future.[1]

But this is by no means all. Such a boy or youth, treated as the Benjamin of the family, would, as we have said, be kept very closely by our Lord to His own side, and this not merely at the Last Supper but at all times. Does not this, and this alone, explain his knowledge of those conversations at which *apparently* no disciples were present but which he himself records as though he had heard every word of them? Who would take notice of the boy sitting always silent in the background, like a young Joshua or Samuel attending upon his master? Certainly not the woman of Samaria, nor even the fearful Nicodemus. And yet he is there all the time, storing up the words of Jesus and like His Mother (perhaps even at her suggestion, for they had met long since) pondering them in his heart. Did he learn even more than this? Did he become so familiar with his

[1] The same argument applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to St. John's unmolested presence at the Cross.

Lord's teaching that his own language slipped unconsciously into the same mould? This at any rate may be suggested as the easiest explanation of a curious and hitherto unexplained phenomenon. There are sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels which have a strangely 'Johannine' ring about them, though the language used is not itself that of the Fourth Gospel (Matt. x. 40, Luke x. 16, Mark ix. 37, John xiii. 20: Matt. xi. 25–7, Luke x. 21–2). Is it possible that these are fragmentary echoes of our Lord's own voice, and that it is this which we hear so consistently in the Gospel of the beloved disciple?

What else do we know, or can we surmise, about this disciple?

(i) From the fact that he was so well known to the High Priest that he had the entrée of his house, we can infer not only that his family was resident in Jerusalem but that in all probability it belonged to the Sadducean priesthood. A memory of this connexion seems to be preserved in a letter written by Polycrates bishop of Ephesus to Victor bishop of Rome (between A.D. 189 and 199) and recorded by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*.[1] Polycrates says that among the 'great lights' who have fallen asleep in Asia are Philip, one of the twelve Apostles, and 'John who was both a witness and a teacher, who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord and being a priest wore the sacerdotal plate.' (It may be noted in passing that the description given by Polycrates confirms the view that this John was not one of

[1] Eus., *Hist. Eccl.* III. xxxi. 3. A Syriac MS. of the Peshitto N.T. discovered in 1930 describes the Fourth Gospel as the preaching of 'John the Younger' (Peake, *Com. Bib.* Supplement, p. 30). This is perhaps as good a name for the author as any that has been devised.

the Twelve.) This makes it antecedently probable that St. John would be familiar with the Temple and its *theologumena.*

(ii) From the fact that he took our Lady to his own home we can infer that St. John was, by that time at least, an orphan, and master of his own house. It may be that his parents were dead before our Lord's ministry began, for this would explain how St. John was free to attach himself to the Baptist and afterwards to Jesus Himself.

(iii) From this point onwards the Gospel tells its own story. St. John having sought out the Baptist was directed by him with St. Andrew to the Christ. (At Cana he first met our Lord's Mother and, to judge from his overhearing her words to the servants, must have been instantly drawn to her side.) Henceforth he remained in close attendance on the Master, going up with Him to Jerusalem when the Twelve were away on their own special missions, but never ranking, of course, as one of the 'Apostles', and still less as one of the Three. This explains two points which might otherwise puzzle us. There is no mention in the Fourth Gospel of any of those occasions on which the Three were chosen to accompany their Master, i.e. the Raising of Jairus' daughter, the Transfiguration, and the Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. If *this* John had been the son of Zebedee, his silence on all three of these great events would have been inexplicable; but this John was present at none of them, therefore he does not record them. *But he does something else, he quotes parallels to them out of his own personal experience.* He did not see the damsel raised from her bed, but he did see Lazarus raised from his tomb. He did not see the Lord transfigured on

the Mount, but he did see Him manifest His Divine Glory in transforming water into wine. He did not see the sweat of blood or hear the prayer in the Garden, but he alone of all the male disciples stood at the Cross itself, and heard the cry 'I thirst', and saw the Blood and the water from the pierced Side. It is surely difficult to believe that this parallelism is wholly undesigned. It is as if the writer is claiming that, even though he is not one of the Twelve, yet his own intimate knowledge of Jesus gives his Gospel an authority which is second to none:

> He that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe. (John xix. 35)

With these reflections to guide us we can now proceed to study the teaching of St. John in the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles which bear his name.[1] One general observation may be made at the start. St. John's relationship to the Synoptists is readily recognized, if we admit the cogency of the arguments just considered: it is that of an eyewitness who is at pains to correct and expand the accounts given by his predecessors, writing (as one of them confesses) at second hand (Luke i. 2). What, however, is perhaps less easily discerned is St. John's close relationship to St. Paul. In thought, style, and phraseology these two seem at first sight to be poles apart, yet the remarkable fact remains that at point after point St. John carries forward, or corroborates out of his own experience, the essential elements

[1] These together 'form a distinct and well-defined group within the New Testament. This literary unity is due partly to an almost certain identity of authorship, partly to a common historical situation' (Hoskyns, 'The Johannine Epistles', *New. Com.*, Part III, p. 658).

of St. Paul's Gospel. To take a few of the more obvious examples. St. Paul (as we have seen) describes our Lord's Divine activity in terms which suggest the work of the 'Word of God':[1] St. John begins his Gospel with this title. St. Paul implies, though he never actually says, that Godhead is Spirit: our Lord in the Fourth Gospel states this truth explicitly. St. Paul comes very near to the affirmation that God is Love: St. John makes it (1 John iv. 8, 16). At each point, that is to say, St. John is found taking the final step which St. Paul in his published writings could have taken yet never actually did take: St. John, as it were, crowns the work of his predecessor.

But St. John did more than this. We have seen that for St. Paul the revelation of the At-one-ment came to its fulness in the mystery of the Body of Christ, and that he expounded this mystery by using, as the 'type' of the New Life of Spirit, the 'flesh'-life of the human organism. In the Fourth Gospel it is also an organism, equally high of its kind[2] (as well as specially appropriate to Israel), which our Lord uses to teach the same mystery. And the parallel, let it be noted, is exact. St. Paul's 'As the body is one and hath many members . . . so also is Christ' (1 Cor. xii. 12) is echoed precisely by St. John's 'I am the vine, ye are the branches' (John xv. 5). It may, of course, be urged that this is merely a coinci-

[1] See above, p. 178. In view of what has been said there it is unnecessary to combat the view that St. John derived his 'Logos-doctrine' from any source but the Old Testament.

[2] To use the technical terms one of the *metaphyta* instead of the *metazoa*, though it is not, of course, suggested that the Evangelist needed or possessed any scientific knowledge of the subject! The Vine had long ranked high in the estimation of Israel, so high indeed that it had become a type of the Nation; cf. Ps. lxxx. 8.

dence, and if it stood alone, there might be some ground for supposing so. But it does not stand alone; and we cannot escape the conclusion that here once again St. John has St. Paul's teaching in mind and that he is confirming it, not merely in words but in essential detail, out of the mouth of the Lord Himself.

The importance of this conclusion becomes evident when we look more deeply into the Prologue (John i. 1–18), which we may now attempt to analyse and paraphrase:

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

1. (*The Inner Life of the Godhead*) The Divine Word was *in the beginning*, that is, before all time and before Creation; and His Being was a movement towards God. For He was not merely an emissary sent out by God from Himself and having no existence before that sending forth: He was Himself God, God facing God (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4).
2. (*The Creation*) The Word then became God's Agent in creation. All things were made through Him, and without Him there was not one thing made (cf. 1 Cor. viii. 6).
3. (*The Fount of New Creation*) But something also came into being, not merely through, but *in* Him.[1] This was Life, and the Life was the Light of men. It shines now in the darkness because the darkness failed to overcome it on the Cross.

THE INCARNATION AND INCORPORATION

4. (*The Witness*) A man was sent from God, John by name, to bear witness concerning the Light that all men may believe through him. He was not

[1] Quick, *Doctrine of the Creeds*, pp. 111–12.

the Light but only a burning and shining lamp (v. 35) which bore witness to the Light.

5. (*The Incarnation*) The true Light which lightens every man came *into* the world. Before this He had manifested His Divine Glory in His Sanctuary (xii. 41), but now He *entered* the world in the flesh (1 John iv. 2; 2 John 7).

6. (*The Rejection*) Yet, when He was thus in the world, the world (though it had been made through Him) did not recognize Him: and when He came to His own People they rejected Him.

7. (*The Redemption*) Nevertheless to all who received Him He gave the power to share His own Sonhood (cf. Gal. iv. 5; Rom. viii. 15)[1]: those who believe on His Name become children of God, being born again not as once in the blood of the womb or through the desire of flesh but as offspring of God by water and Spirit (iii. 5; cf. Rom. vi. 4; viii. 14).

8. (*The Incorporation*)[2] The Word was made Flesh so that we abide in Him (vi. 51, 53, 55–7; xv. 4) and 'tabernacled' in us (and we beheld His Glory descending at Pentecost, the Glory of the Only-begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth), . . . And of His (one) fulness we all received, and grace against grace (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 4).[3]

CONCLUSION

9. This, then, is the work that has been done for us.

[1] See below, p. 239 f. [2] See below, p. 250.

[3] The meaning seems to be exactly parallel to that of St. Paul. We *all* received Christ's fulness (in the one Spirit), grace (in His diversity of gifts) counterbalancing grace (in the one Body).

> Whereas the Law was enjoined externally through Moses, grace and truth have come into being in us through Jesus Christ. God remains transcendent and invisible, but He has been revealed by the Only-begotten Son who is close to His bosom. The Light which came into being in the Word has thus passed into us who have been made the children of God and have the Spirit of truth abiding in us (xiv. 17).

The general outlines of this analysis will probably not evoke much criticism, but the paraphrase will certainly be less fortunate: and since the main battle-field lies in the interpretation of verse 14 ('the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us') it will be well to concentrate upon this before going further.

One thing ought to be made clear first of all. Because a particular meaning has been assigned to these words for centuries, it does not follow of necessity that the meaning is the right one. The sole question to be considered is whether St. John could and did use these words in a sense which has long since ceased to be familiar but which in his own day was both familiar and vitally significant.[1] Any other way of looking at the matter is a mere surrender to traditional preconceptions, when what we have to decide is a plain matter of

[1] The language of Naomorphism can never have meant so much to a Gentile, as it did to a Jewish, Christian; and when the Temple had been destroyed it lost a good deal of its immediate relevance. This and the terseness of St. John's language will explain why the original significance of these words tended to fade, though it was never wholly forgotten. Both Cyril of Alexandria (*Third Ep. to Nestorius*, iii) and Leo (*Tome* ii) render correctly 'dwelt in us', though they refer this indwelling to the Incarnation (Conception) rather than the Incorporation (see below Additional Note, p. 245). So also the Curetonian Syriac, the Peshitto, and the Diatessaron (Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 345).

fact. First then, *could* St. John have said that the Word 'tabernacled' in us? There is no doubt at all that he could. St. Paul himself had used precisely the same language about the Indwelling of Christ through His Spirit and we have already seen how close the relationship is between the two writers. But, more than this, we have to go no further than the second chapter of the Fourth Gospel to find its author explicitly teaching this very truth. For it is St. John, and St. John alone of the Evangelists, who tells us how our Lord interpreted His own saying about the Naos. When the Jews asked Him for a sign to show by what authority He cleansed the Hieron,

> Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this Naos, and in three days I will raise it up. The Jews therefore said, Forty and six years was this Naos in building, and wilt thou raise it up in three days? But he spake of the Naos of his body. When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he spake this: and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said. (John. ii. 19–22)

In the light of what has been said in previous chapters, the meaning of this passage should be perfectly clear. The Resurrection of the Lord 'in three days' implied the resurrection of Israel in His Body, but it involved much more than this, because His Body was the new Naos, the perfect Sanctuary of the 'tabernacling' Godhead. This doctrine, as we have seen, was not Pauline in origin but arose from the disciples' new understanding of 'the scripture'. At the same time it is difficult to resist the impression that St. John is once again confirming St. Paul's doctrine out of the mouth of Jesus Himself.

But this is by no means all the evidence which can be cited for St. John's knowledge and use of the language of Naomorphism. It is he who reminds us that the 'glory' which Isaiah saw in the Naos (Isa. vi. 1–8) was the Glory of the pre-Incarnate Word Himself (John xii. 41). More important still, it is he who gives us our Lord's own interpretation of the prophecy concerning the 'Living Waters' which were to flow forth out of the new Naos:[1]

> Now on the last day, the great day of the feast [of Tabernacles], Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet; because Jesus was not yet glorified. (vii. 37–9)

Two things may be noted here. First it is clear that the reader is expected to understand what 'scripture' is intended, even if he may not know enough about the Temple-ritual to recognize the connexion between these words of Jesus and the ceremony of Water-pouring which took place during the Feast of Tabernacles. As in the previous citation of the 'Resurrection-Naos' scripture, so again here also we have a quite casual but very valuable indication of the existence of a whole body of teaching, with which the instructed Christian was assumed to be familiar. We make, in fact, a very great mistake if we suppose that the early Church had no more solid nutriment than the 'first principles of the oracles of God' (Heb. v. 12).

The second point is of equal or even greater interest.

[1] See above, pp. 98–100.

It has been suggested above[1] that the ceremony referred to was originally little better than an act of sympathetic magic based on the belief that the sacred rock under the Naos was the Navel of the Earth beneath which the living waters of the abyss had been imprisoned at the creation. Now in the earliest days of the Israelite Settlement, when the national Sanctuary stood facing Ebal and Gerizim, a spot in this neighbourhood was also called the Navel of the Earth (Judges ix. 37), and it may very well be that the same belief was attached to it; and, in fact, that both the name and the tradition about it were transferred in later times to the new capital and Sanctuary at Jerusalem. If this be so, it throws an unexpected light on our Lord's conversation with the woman of Samaria, at Jacob's well. This well, itself something of a mystery since there is an abundance of springs in the locality, possessed alike for Jews and for Samaritans an immemorial sanctity; and it is not at all impossible that it may itself have figured as the original 'Navel of the Earth'. There would then be a deep underlying significance in the fact that according to St. John it was here first that Jesus spoke of the Living Waters of Life:

> Everyone that drinketh of this water shall thirst again: but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up into eternal life. (iv. 13–14)

The promise here is not so full as that given at Jerusalem itself, but the thought expressed is clearly identical: and we are not surprised when in a moment more

[1] See above, pp. 99–100.

the conversation turns to the one crucial subject which divided the Samaritans from the Jews:

> Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. Ye worship that which ye know not; we worship that which we know, for salvation is from the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is Spirit; and they that worship him must worship in Spirit and in truth. (iv. 20–4)

This answer of Jesus has puzzled those readers of the Fourth Gospel who think they find there a purely 'spiritual' religion. What our Lord 'ought' to have said on this assumption was that both Jews and Samaritans had misconceived the true principles of worship. But Jesus was not only a prophet of Israel (iv. 19), He was the Messiah in whom all prophecy must be fulfilled (iv. 26): and it was impossible that he should speak of the worship inspired by Ezekiel, Haggai, and Zechariah as if it were a vain invention of human blindness and ignorance. It was not at Jerusalem that men worshipped 'they knew not what':

> There is a river, the streams whereof make glad the city of God,
> The holy place of the tabernacle of the Most Highest.
> God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved:
> God shall help her, at the dawn of the morning . . .
> Jahweh Sabaoth is with us;
> The God of Jacob is our refuge. (Ps. xlvi. 4, 5, 7)

Other temples, like that of Gerizim, might be raised to

the 'God of Jacob', but nowhere except in Jerusalem could the true Covenant-worship be offered, the worship of 'Jahweh Sabaoth that sitteth between the cherubim'. Only in Jerusalem could *that* be offered; for there and there only the supreme paradox, which Israel *knew* to be the central mystery of its faith, was mediated to it in outward and visible form;—that God 'the Most Highest', the Invisible, the infinitely Transcendent, had willed for His People's sake to 'tabernacle' in its midst.

What then of the future? When we remember what our Lord said at the Feast of Tabernacles, we cannot be in doubt as to His meaning here. He is very far from telling the Samaritan woman that the covenant-worship of Jerusalem will henceforth be set aside. What He says is rather that in the Light of His own Revelation this worship will be transfigured and fulfilled. For Jesus comes to reveal the Most Highest, the Invisible and Transcendent God, as 'the Father' (iv. 21–3); and the mystery of His 'tabernacling' Presence as the Spirit which He gives to those who believe on His Son (vii. 38): and those who would hereafter worship Him truly must worship Him in the concrete Reality of this Fellowship of Spirit (iv. 24; cf. xvii. 17, 19, 21).[1]

We may return now to the starting-point of this discussion. The question was whether St. John *could* have said in his Prologue that the Word 'tabernacled' in us; and it may be hoped that no doubt is now left in the reader's mind that he most certainly could have done so. It remains, then, to ask whether this is actually his

[1] So we may paraphrase 'in Spirit and truth'. It must be remembered that to St. John 'truth' is a concrete reality which a man must not only apprehend but *do* (iii. 21; 1 John i. 6; iii. 18).

meaning. For there are two other possibilities. First, St. John may have been using the rather unusual word *eskenōsen* (lit. 'tented') in a purely figurative sense and without any idea of Naomorphism. This possibility, however, seems to be excluded at once by the direct reference to the 'Glory' which immediately follows and is plainly intended to show what this 'tenting' signifies. It may, in fact, be taken as quite indubitable that St. John is here deliberately using the language of Naomorphism. Even, however, if this is granted, there still remains a doubt as to his exact meaning. We have to face the second possibility, that St. John is referring to our Lord's earthly life and ministry and that he describes this by saying that 'the Word "tabernacled" *among* us'.

This is, of course, the interpretation accepted by most scholars. They recognize that St. John is speaking of the Word as though He were the Shekinah, but since little or no research has been made into the mystery of the 'tabernacling' Presence, they are content to note the fact and pass on. But it will not do. This interpretation cannot possibly be the true one for two very good reasons, one of them inherent in the subject itself, the other in St. John's own teaching elsewhere. The first reason can be very briefly and simply stated. Once it is admitted that the specific language of Naomorphism is being used here, it is no longer legitimate to use it in any other than its own specific sense. If you say that the Word 'tabernacled', you cannot retreat from that position, you cannot say that it *merely* means 'dwelt'. If then St. John says 'The Word "tabernacled" *among* us', what can he be supposed to mean? The Divine Presence 'tabernacled' *among* Israel under the Old

Covenant: does St. John mean the same thing here? We might be disposed to ask why, if he does so, he speaks of this 'tabernacling' as being among '*us*', when on this assumption it must have been among the whole of His People. But this is a comparatively trivial objection, for the truth is that St. John cannot possibly have meant this. In the first place, as we have seen again and again, the 'tabernacling' of God in the New Age was to be the final and eternal consummation of Israel's destiny: hence it would not be identified by St. John with our Lord's earthly life, since on this view the 'tabernacling' must have ceased with His Ascension. In the second place, the *theologumenon* of the 'tabernacling' Presence was inseparably connected with the thought of eucharistic worship and communion with God: yet St. John records no act of adoration offered to the 'tabernacling' Word before the Resurrection. But there is a yet more formidable objection. If this 'tabernacling' of the Word took place in His earthly lifetime, where or in what did He 'tabernacle'? What, in a word, was His Naos? The unwary reader will almost certainly fall into a trap here, for he will remember our Lord's own saying about the Naos which is His Body (ii. 21). But the Body referred to here is our Lord's Resurrection-Body, i.e. that glorified Flesh into which as a New Creation we are born again (ii. 22). To describe the Incarnation as the 'dwelling' of the Word in a body was possible for a Greek like St. Athanasius who in fact often speaks of our Lord's body as His 'temple' and 'instrument'. But this conception, in itself inadequate and even dangerously misleading, was hardly thinkable for a Jew with his firm grasp of man's constitution as a psycho-physical organism.

This question, however, need not detain us, for it is settled once and for all by one plain fact. There could only be *one* Naos, and before our Lord's Death this Naos was the actual building in Jerusalem. This is a point about which there can be no doubt, and since it is of crucial importance to our argument, it must be made as clear as possible.

Our Lord's Saying 'Destroy this Naos,' &c. can be interpreted in several different ways. The Jews supposed that He meant that if the actual building under their eyes were destroyed He would build it again in three days. This, as we know, was wrong; but it would be equally wrong to imagine that our Lord meant 'Destroy my body and I will raise it in three days'; for this would be to ignore the whole point of the sign, namely that the old Naos was to be superseded by the new. What our Lord really meant can be seen quite clearly in the wording of the charge against Him which has been preserved by St. Mark: 'I will destroy this Naos that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands.' This, as we have seen, represents the original apostolic tradition. Jesus is the 'Lord', who comes suddenly to His Naos, that is to the actual building in Jerusalem; and He not merely purifies it but purifies it as a sign of the greater purification which is to take place on the Cross. There

[1] See above, p. 191, and cf. Col. ii. 9. When St. Paul says that the fulness of the Godhead 'tabernacles' in Christ '*bodily*', he is speaking of that 'body' in which we are 'rooted and builded up' (Col. ii. 7: note the Naomorphism), 'having been buried with him in baptism' and 'raised with him', &c. (Col. ii. 12; cf. Rom. i. 4 'declared to be the Son of God' &c.; Phil. ii. 9, 10; Eph. i. 20–3). St. Paul no more than St. John could have spoken of Jesus in His earthly life as one in whom Godhead 'dwelt', but quite apart from this his Gospel was not concerned with Christ 'after the flesh' (2 Cor. 16 f.).

He is to consecrate the new Naos which is His Body, and in that same hour the Veil of the old Naos will be rent from top to bottom. Till then the old Naos has its original 'standing' (Heb. ix. 8, cf. Matt. xxiii. 16-21). The Glory may not be present in it, but it is still the Naos, still the place hallowed by the People for the Presence; and until God Himself visibly makes void its Holy of Holies, there can be no other.

Readers unfamiliar with the language of Naomorphism may not at first appreciate the full significance of this thought, and it must therefore be pressed home still further. When St. John uses this language, he uses it in his own strict and proper context, that is in the context of Sacred *History*. This is the meaning of the 'not yet' in the passage which relates to the 'Living Waters' from the Naos (vii. 39). There was no new Naos—and so no fulfilment of Ezekiel's vision—*until* Jesus had been 'glorified', that is *until* He had been exalted to that Glory which He had with the Father before the world was (xvii. 5).[1] Then His prayer was answered, and His disciples beheld that Glory descending upon them which was in truth the Glory of the Only-begotten from the Father (xvii. 22–4; i. 14), for it was the outward and visible sign of the Spirit; the Presence not only of Jesus but of the Father with the Son (xiv. 23); the Living

[1] Cf. Acts ii. 33, 'Being by the right hand of God exalted and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this etc.' For St. John the 'Glory' denotes the manifestation of Godhead (i. 14; ii. 11 (iv. 54); xii. 41). Since God is Love, this Glory is manifested by Jesus supremely on the Cross (xii. 28; xiii. 31). But because Love is the Eternal Life of the Father with the Son in the Spirit the Glory of the Cross is not consummated *until* this life has been sent by the Only-begotten from the Father to 'tabernacle' in the Church, and draw all men into Himself and through Him into the heavenly mansions, where He is with the Father (xvii. 24).

Principle of the Eternal At-one-ness given to the New Naos for its own at-one-ment (xvii. 22).

We shall have more to say on this later but may add one final warning here against a superficial treatment of St. John's Naomorphism. If the reader is still not convinced about the meaning of 'tabernacled', let him take the verse as a whole and see where it leads him on any other theory. Now when St. John says 'The *Word* "tabernacled" ' he must be taken as meaning exactly what he says. He does not say (and therefore he does not mean) that the *Spirit* 'tabernacled' in the man Jesus; nor, we may add, is there any ground for supposing that he could have harboured such a thought. He tells us that the Spirit was seen by the Baptist 'abiding *upon*' Jesus as a dove, but he says that this was simply the sign by which John was to recognize the Baptizer in Holy Spirit. The idea that the Incarnate Word Himself enshrined a second 'tabernacling' Presence is certainly not Johannine. But in any case what St. John says is that the *Word* 'tabernacled'; and if He 'tabernacled' not 'in us' but merely 'among us', He must have 'tabernacled' *in*—Himself. But this is to make a distinction between the Word and the Man Jesus which is even more repugnant to St. John's teaching (cf. 1 John ii. 22; iv. 2–3, &c.);[1] and, even if

[1] Hoskyns is extremely obscure here. On i. 14 he writes: 'The Word of God had brought into being a man (the word "flesh" means neither more nor less than this). This does not mean that the Eternal Word of God was transformed into an observable, historical individual man. In that case faith would be disestablished; whereas in Jesus faith is altogether established. Indeed, apart from faith He is a meaningless figure in history and His flesh is unprofitable. That a man was created by the Word of God means that He became the place of revelation. The Word of God had been made known in the two tables of stone on which was engraved the law of God in commandments. The Word of

this were not so, it would be a wholly illegitimate interpretation for those who refer the preceding words to the Conception. If 'the Word *became* or *was made* flesh' is St. John's description of that mystery, it is inconceivable that he should add in the same breath that the Word 'tabernacled' *in* that Flesh. Had he put it that the Word came '*in* the flesh' (an expression which he uses elsewhere of the Incarnation), the contention would at least have been arguable, but it is expressly excluded by the words actually used here. The conclusion (and it is really the only possible conclusion) is that St. John is not referring in this verse to our Lord's Conception and Ministry: he is speaking of that mystery of a New Creation which was inaugurated in His Flesh upon the Cross and was first manifested in the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost.

The evidence of terminology appears then to be quite decisive; and yet, regarded simply in itself, it is of secondary importance. What really matters is whether these words in St. John's Prologue do in truth adum-

God is now engraved, not in stone, but in human flesh. What the Temple had been, the man Jesus has now become more transparently—the tabernacle of God with men' (*The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 132–3; cf. p. 191, 'the observable, historical, man Jesus'). Whatever Hoskyns meant here, it is evident that 'the word of God brought into being a man' cannot possibly be a paraphrase of 'The Word was made flesh'. Nor again would St. Paul have accepted the application to Christ of what he says in 2 Cor. iii of His members. For St. Paul it is not Christ that is the Naos but we, because we are members of His Body. Christ Himself can be called the 'corner-stone' just as He can be called the 'Head', but both these expressions mean that He is the Integrator and Co-ordinator of the parts of the whole, the transcendent and yet immanent principle of their at-one-ment. In the Naomorphic passage Eph. iii. 16–19 the indwelling of Christ in His Naos is clearly emphasized. This truth is correctly stated by St. Augustine (Hoskyns, p. 337): 'We abide in Him, because we are His members; but He abides in us, because we are His temple.'

brate a mystery which lies at the heart of his Gospel. If they do not, our previous argument fails to possess more than a purely academic interest. We must therefore go on to apply this final test. Let us first of all turn back to the 'Prologue' itself. This title, it should be noted, has been given by scholars to the short semi-independent section with which the Gospel opens (i. 1–18), because the writer is evidently seeking to present here in summarized form the great truths with which he is to deal in the course of his book. Assuming then that this was his intention, we may reasonably expect to find in this synopsis an ordered sequence of thought: and our analysis in fact reveals this. In particular we may notice how, after he has introduced the Baptist, St. John carries us without a break to the rejection of the Word by His own and the New Birth which He gives to those who believe on His Name (our sections 4–7). Now this New Birth is to be later on the subject of our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus (iii. 1–15); and the description of it there as an 'earthly' mystery 'of water and Spirit' (iii. 12, 5) refers almost explicitly to Baptism. Thus it is evident that at this stage of the Prologue the Crucifixion and Resurrection are regarded historically as past, and the New Life in Christ as having just begun. What then of the words which follow? Are we to suppose that St. John now goes back to the Virgin Birth, when he says that 'the Word was made Flesh'? On the face of it that is surely improbable; and once we have realized that the words immediately connected with it refer not to our Lord's earthly life but to His 'tabernacling' in His glorified Body, our doubt is proportionately strengthened. It becomes natural then to ask whether there is not a much more profound significance

in St. John's choice of language. He has described the Virgin Birth elsewhere as the mystery of Jesus Christ come (or coming) 'in the flesh' (1 John iv. 2; 2 John 7): why then *here* is he not content to say the same?

It is assumed by some that St. John uses this expression with the direct intention of combating the views of the Docetae, who maintained that the Word only apparently took human nature. There is, however, no evidence for this, and in any case the simpler language of the epistles would have been amply sufficient for this purpose. On the other hand, to say that the Word *became flesh* is itself exposed to the gravest misunderstanding. 'Owing to the inherent imperfection of human language as applied to the mystery of the Incarnation, both these words are liable to misinterpretation. The word *became* must not be so understood as to support the belief that the Word ceased to be what He was before; and the word *flesh* must not be taken to exclude the rational soul of man' (Westcott). Again then, *why does St. John risk using them?* Surely the answer must be that he uses them because they *and they only* express at all adequately the mystery of which he is speaking; the mystery not of the initial Conception 'by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary' but of the New Humanity into which we are born again? Clearly this is a question which must be decided, if it can be decided at all, by reference to the Fourth Gospel as a whole.

Let us then consider its salient features. The most pronounced of these is St. John's emphasis on the Eternal Sonhood through which we receive Life:

> These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name. (xx. 31)

It is to this Sonhood that the Baptist at once bears witness (i. 34); and it is to be noted that he does so in such a way as to exclude two possible misunderstandings. First it might be thought that the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus constituted Him then for the first time the Son of God. But the Baptist declares that this sign was given to him personally with the sole object of identifying the Baptizer 'in Holy Spirit' (i. 33). Second, it was very easy by a slip of the memory to give an entirely false rendering of the Voice from heaven. That Voice, according to the Synoptists, proclaimed:

> Thou art [This is] my beloved Son, in thee [in Whom] I am well pleased;

but it was fatally easy to substitute for this the familiar words of the Psalm:

> Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.[1]

To this the Baptist has his own firm reply:

> He that cometh after me is become before me: for he was before me . . . (i. 15)

Here, however, we need to exercise caution. We have to remind ourselves, as has been said before,[2] that while the thought of our Lord's Eternal Sonhood has long since become familiar to every Christian, it was entirely strange to a Jew of the first century. There was, on the other hand, 'one mode or aspect of the Divine Activity on earth which was as familiar to every Jew of our Lord's day as the idea of the Divine Sonhood is to us

[1] Ps. ii. 7. This reading actually occurs in some manuscripts of St. Luke's Gospel and survives in some Christian writers (e.g. Justin, Clement, Lactantius, Hilary).

[2] See above, pp. 129–30.

now'. This was conceived, as we have seen, in a variety of ways, as the Angel of the Presence or of the Covenant, the Divine Word, the Divine Wisdom, the Shekinah, &c.; and all these could be gathered up into the prophecy of Malachi that the 'Lord' would come suddenly to His Naos.[1] In the Fourth Gospel, even more explicitly than in St. Paul's epistles, this Presence is called the Word, the old idea of a semi-hypostatized Divine Energy being replaced by the revelation of a Personal Being. Nor is this only, as some have thought, in the Prologue: in the body of the Gospel itself it is *first* the Word, and only after this the Son, whose Glory is manifested in His works. It is the Word who brings (not water from the rock but) wine from water. It is the Word who feeds, not with manna from the skies, but with loaves and fishes miraculously multiplied. It is the Word who walks upon the sea and brings His faithful 'to the haven where they would be' (vi. 21; Ps. cvii. 30). It is the Word who claims that pre-existence which is expressed in the Ineffable Name, and before whom, at the mere suggestion of the cadences of that Name, His enemies are hurled backward upon the ground (viii. 58; xviii. 6). All through this Gospel, in short, whether in immediate connexion with the Naos or not, that Divine Presence is seen walking on earth 'in the flesh', whose Glory Isaiah once saw high and lifted up among adoring Seraphim (xii. 41).

Yet this is only the beginning of the Gospel of the Incarnation. The Word comes into the world in the flesh, not to do signs and wonders, but to reveal through these the true nature of the Invisible Transcendent God, and His purpose of Love for the world (v. 36,

[1] See above, pp. 130–3.

&c.). And in the accomplishment of this mission the Word reveals Himself also. He is the Word, but not simply that Word of whom it was spoken:

> My word that goeth forth out of my mouth . . . shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I send it. (Isa. lv. 11)

The Glory which the Word manifested on earth in the flesh was not only the Glory of the World's Creator, the Divine Companion, Protector, and promised Redeemer of Israel; it was the Glory of God's Only-begotten, His Beloved from before all time, giving Himself yet given also by His Father, for the salvation of the world (i. 14; x. 17–18; iii. 16).

How then does the Word as Son fulfil this purpose? He is the Light which lighteth every man (i. 9; viii. 12, &c.): does this mean that He saves man by instructing him in the truth? We have our answer to this almost at the beginning of the Fourth Gospel. When Nicodemus addresses Jesus as 'Rabbi' and speaks of Him as 'having come from God a teacher' (to preserve the actual order of the words), our Lord at once exposes the mistake which this compliment implies. It is not by the instruction of the mind that a man can see and enter the kingdom of God; he must be born again 'of water and Spirit', i.e. body, soul, and spirit together. This New Birth, though the thought of it utterly bewilders Nicodemus, is still only an 'earthly' mystery. If he, then, who professes to be the teacher of Israel is unable to understand this, how is it possible that the human mind should be capable of apprehending the 'heavenly' mystery which it foreshadows? Only one son of man has seen and heard that highest Truth, but

He is the Son of man who came down from heaven and ascends thither again. And it is not by teaching that He brings the truth to man, it is by the offering of Himself, body and soul, for their Salvation:

> As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life.[1]
>
> (iii. 14; cf. xii. 32–3)

Deeply mysterious as all this must have been to Nicodemus, to us it presents no difficulty, and we may pass on to the second passage in which our Lord speaks of the New Life which is to be received through His saving Death. Now (chapter vi) the New *Birth* is assumed to have taken place and the subject is that of the Heavenly Food through which the Eternal Life imparted through it abides in the believer. Here once again there is no question of any purely mental or spiritual pabulum: rather the Bread of Heaven offers Himself in the most concrete objective form:

> I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: *Yea and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.*
>
> (vi. 51)

Once more, this 'hard saying' which drove many disciples from His side is clear enough to us who know that He is speaking of His New Glorified Humanity. He who through death has been given by His Father the 'authority' (or right) 'over all flesh' (xvii. 2) can thus 'gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad' (xi. 52) and hold them in abiding union with Himself. For this indeed He has come 'in

[1] Cf. Wisdom xvi. 5–13, where it is said that those bitten by the serpents were cured by 'thy Word, O Lord, which healeth all things'.

the flesh', that through the Death of the Cross He may become that Flesh which is the food of Eternal Life. Through Death, for even the Incarnate Word cannot become *that* Flesh till He has given it for the Life of the World. Through Death, and therefore those who believe on Him must not only eat His Flesh but drink His Blood. Then for them that mystery is consummated which is at once their Life in Jesus Christ and His in them:

> He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him. (vi. 56)

This is what we may call the first climax of St. John's Gospel of the At-one-ment. In the scene with which we have been dealing it appears in its abruptest form, rather as a challenge to faith in the Person of the Speaker than as the revelation of a joyful mystery which is to be realized in His Body. It is only when our Lord is alone with His disciples before His Passion that He opens its fulness to them out of His heart of love. Then after His New Commandment that they shall live as He has lived, He gives them the promise of 'another Paraclete' who will abide in them for ever (xiv. 16–17); that Spirit of Truth whose Presence dwelling within them will yet be also the Presence within them of the Father and the Son (xiv. 18, 23; 1 John iii. 24). He will teach them all things and bring to their remembrance all that the Lord has said unto them (xiv. 26), so that in that day they shall *know* that

> I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you. (xiv. 20)

Then when the disciples have risen with Him and are standing around Him, the Lord discloses yet more of the meaning of this mystery. He has bidden them arise and

go forth with Him (xiv. 31), for there can be no passive sitting still or reclining at table for those who share the Flesh of the Son of man. He goes forth to that hour for which He came, to Gethsemane and the lifting-up on the Cross: they go forth with Him now, that hereafter they may go forth *in* Him, born again through His Death and Resurrection and made partakers of His Body and His Blood. It has been thought strange by some that St. John makes no mention in his Gospel of the Last Supper; and yet in reality he does something better than this. He reveals to us out of our Lord's mouth the truth which the Holy Communion embodies and expresses; that inner essence of it which is the proclaiming of the Lord's death till He come (1 Cor. xi. 26). Now Jesus looks beyond the hour when the seed that must be sown shall have died that it may bear much fruit (xii. 24); and He shows His disciples how through that Death the agelong mystery of the People and the Presence has at last attained its consummation.

For the Risen Christ is the true Vine, the true Israel of God; and a true vine does not exist for its own sake, it lives in order to bear fruit for the husbandman who has planted and tilled it (xv. i). Such then is the Life of the New Israel:

> Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit; for apart from me ye can do nothing. . . . Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; and so shall ye be my disciples. (xv. 4–5, 8)

The Life of the New Israel is thus revealed as a 'going forth' into the world in the strength of the Sacrifice of

Love by which it lives (xv. 12–13) and in the abiding power of that Love (xv. 9). That is its mission from Jesus (xv. 16); and though the world will hate and persecute it, it must bear witness to His Love by the witness of its own Love in the never-failing witness of the Indwelling Spirit (xv. 18–27).

It is when we have reached this point in the unfolding by our Lord of the mystery of His New Humanity that we are able to recognize the pregnant significance of those mysterious words in the Prologue:

The Word was made Flesh	and 'tabernacled' in us.
Abide in me	and I in you.

Here from our Lord's own lips we have an exact description of that 'Fulness' from which 'we have all received', and which is centred for us in the Communion of His Flesh and Blood. This is that glorious and joyful mystery wherein the 'tabernacling' Presence not merely inhabits the 'Naos made without hands' but unites Himself with it in complete all-penetrating intimacy. He makes it one with Him in Flesh that it may be one with Him in Spirit: He gives it His own Life of Love that it may give out that Love in the offering of its own life in and for the world: He fills it with His 'Fulness' that it may be the Fulness of Him that filleth all things. So St. John crowns, even verbally, St. Paul's gospel of the At-one-ment, but he does even more than this. He shows us that this mystery of New Birth and New Life finds its deepest Truth in the essential Being of the Godhead. The 'earthly' points upward to the 'Heavenly', for it is Spirit, not Flesh, which is man's Eternal Home (iii. 12; vi. 63; xii. 26; xvii. 24): and now the Beloved Disciple, out of his unique

'remembrance', lifts the veil which hides that glory from our eyes.

It has been suggested above that in the Fourth Gospel it is first the Word, and only after that the Son, whose glory is seen manifested on earth: and it may be noted now that the Prologue itself confirms this order. It begins by proclaiming the Word as One who is eternally within the Godhead, and it is only towards the end of it that we find His glory described as that of the Only-begotten who is 'in the bosom of the Father'. And this, as we have seen, was the natural course which Revelation must follow, if it was to be intelligible to disciples trained in Old Testament modes of thought.[1] First it must be seen that what had been thought of as a semi-hypostatized effluence or emanation from God was in reality a Personal Being: and since such a Being, if He existed from all Eternity, could only stand in one possible relationship to God, it followed of necessity that He must be His Son. Thus our Lord's own affirmation of His Sonhood, though it remained a mystery with depths still unfathomed, presented no insuperable difficulties of thought to men who already believed in Him as the Word.

But what does the Sonhood of the Word really imply? Here, too, there is an ascending path of apprehension to be followed, in which two steps can be clearly distinguished. In the first of these the emphasis still rests upon the thought of the Word as the immediate emissary and representative of God. He is the Word who goes forth to accomplish the Divine Purpose, but because He is also the Son, He reveals this Purpose as being that of His Father's love for the world (iii. 16).

[1] See above, p. 229.

The thought of Sonhood here is strictly subordinated to that of the Will which He comes to serve, so that it is actually possible for men to acknowledge it, even though they reject its deeper implications:

> If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the scripture cannot be broken), say ye of him, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do them, though ye believe not in me, believe the works; that ye may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father. (x. 35–8)

It is this aspect of the Word's Sonhood which is predominant in the earlier chapters of the Fourth Gospel and it is doubtless for this reason that a certain, almost impersonal, austerity seems to pervade our Lord's language there. He proclaims Himself repeatedly as One who has been sent and who can of Himself do nothing. The Father loving the Son has given all things into His hand, yet no man can come to the Son unless the Father draws him. So again, though the Son makes Himself 'equal with God', it is as One who speaks only those things which He hears from the Father, and works only those works which the Father has given Him to accomplish. He is the Son; yet Sonhood here seems to be almost equivalent to 'Word-hood', the manifestation in the flesh of God's Personal Utterance, who bears witness by His works and words to Him whom 'no man hath seen at any time'. All men by the Father's Will must honour the Son, but this is because 'he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which sent him'.[1]

[1] The references in this paragraph are chiefly from chapter v.

This first impression, though definite and unmistakable, is not of course permanent. As we read on, it becomes clear that this complete subordination of the Son to the Father's service does not imply the operation of a single Will whose counsels the Word carries into effect with an almost automatic precision. The Son, too, has His own Will:

> For I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will but the will of him that sent me. And this is the will of him that sent me, that of all that which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day. (vi. 38–9)

Now, in short, the full Personality of the Son begins to emerge, and all that has been said before must be understood in the light of this revelation. The Word who is the Image of God is not simply the Perfect Reflection of His Love; He comes in His own right, and in His own right gives Himself freely for the salvation of the world:

> Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have the right to lay it down, and I have the right to take it again. (x. 18)

With these words the mystery of the Godhead begins to disclose its glowing heart of Love. What had seemed before to be rigid and exact performance of Another's Will is seen now to be something far more wonderful. The Work is one, the Purpose one, the Love which gives itself for that Purpose is one and the same; yet in the performance of it two Wills are blended in ceaseless and perfect mutual self-giving and co-operation, where

there is no first nor last, but Sent and Sender are one. Now Sonhood stands revealed in its full Glory. We think of it no longer as merely defining the Godhead of the Personal Word: from henceforth it comes into its own by the right of that Eternal Relationship which it connotes:

> This is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ. (xvii. 3)

From henceforth, that is, the Father and the Son must be acknowledged as an indissoluble unity. God is 'the true God', *because* He is the Father of the Son, and the Son cannot be named without naming the Father also. We cannot think of God at all now, except as the Father with the Son and the Son with the Father, an Eternal At-one-ness, whose essential Life is Love.

Here then we reach the consummation of St. John's Gospel of the At-one-ment. God is Spirit, and we who worship Him must worship Him in that 'concrete Reality of Spirit'[1] which is Eternal At-one-ness through Love. This is the keynote of our Salvation. Jesus came as the Good Shepherd that He might gather His one flock into the one fold of which He Himself is the Door (x. 14–16; xi. 52). He was 'made Flesh' that we might 'abide in Him'; that is, that we might become one Flesh in Him through the communion of His Flesh and Blood.[2] But we can only become one in Him if we 'love one another'. Our Lord's 'Abide in me' is therefore simply another form of His New Commandment; and

[1] See above, p. 220.

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. x. 16–17: 'The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of this one bread.'

it represents the one offering, the one act of worship which God requires and accepts from us and which we are to present to Him under the eyes of the world:

> A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love amongst one another.
>
> (xiii. 34–5)

But this Royal Priesthood, which offers the holy and living sacrifice of At-one-ment by being in itself that which it offers, can only worship in the Reality of Spirit because it is the Naos of the Eternal At-one-ness. 'Abide in me', that is the Commandment; 'And I in you' that is the Truth which makes the commandment bearable, and needs no verb to explain it. The Word 'tabernacles' in us; and because He is the Son, He cannot 'tabernacle' alone. Through Him the Spirit of Truth abides with us and is in us, and in that Spirit the Father and the Son make Their abode with us, and Their Love becomes our home (xiv. 16–23).

So the agelong dispensation of At-one-ment rises to that last peak of Revelation beyond which the human eye, however inspired, is powerless to follow it. Even now indeed no further words of Jesus to His disciples can make them understand its full mystery and joy and wonder. In this last moment before Gethsemane, when the Incarnate Lord looks through Death and Resurrection and Ascension to that supreme Day when the work of Love will be complete, it is as the Son communing with the Father that He utters the great prayer which for their sake and ours He suffers them to overhear. Then for a brief space we behold the vision promised to Nathanael: we see the heaven opened, and

the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man. For 'the Word was made Flesh and "tabernacled" in us'; and it is upon that Flesh which the Son of man sanctifies through His Blood that He now invokes the Father's Blessing. His Church, His Body, that precious and beloved part of Him which He is leaving in the world, this is to be henceforth the vessel and the witness of His Glory on earth; and as He sends it forth on His own Mission of At-one-ment, so He asks that it may be sanctified with that Glory which alone can make the many one:

> Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word; that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us, that the world may believe that thou didst send me. And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in thee, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me. Father that which thou hast given me, I will that, where I am, they also may be with me; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. O righteous Father, the world knew thee not, but I knew thee; and these knew that thou didst send me; and I made known unto them thy name, and will make it known; that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them.
>
> (xvii. 20–6)

As we read these words we know that our journey is ended; and has any journey been longer and stranger than this? It began nearly fifteen hundred years before this night, when the Sacred Ark marched for the first time in the van of the People of God. Through the

centuries which followed the departure from the Flaming Mount we have watched the progress of that mysterious emblem, of the belief which it expressed, and of the deeper truth which it foreshadowed. We have seen how at first the paradox of the 'tabernacling' Presence aroused in Israel no thought but one of joyful and exalted thankfulness, the naïve response of hearts as yet unclouded by any profound consciousness of sin. And when that consciousness had been awakened by the prophets, and with it a deeper realization of the transcendent holiness of God, we have seen how in spite of all this the faith of Israel in the Covenant-Presence never wavered, and the old eucharistic worship of the altar never became obsolete. It is surely a remarkable story. Reading it merely as a chapter in the religious history of mankind, we should be forced to admit that it was entirely without parallel. But for us it is Sacred History, and possessing this clue we have been able to explain what at first sight may appear inexplicable. The People and the Presence, man providing a dwelling-place for God, this conjunction of thought might well seem foolishness, an absurdity of the primitive mind to be outgrown and quickly forgotten. But we have found that it is that foolishness which is 'wiser than men' (1 Cor. i. 25), and that through it man can enter into the heart of God.

It is a staggering conclusion, when we are first brought face to face with it, yet that is quite simply what we learn from the Fourth Gospel: and here supremely St. John crowns the teaching of St. Paul. St. Paul has shown us what Love means when we think of it as the Life of the Body of Christ. It means the Fellowship of Holy Spirit, in which all the members,

fitly framed and knit together from the Head, serve one another by self-sacrifice and long-suffering, by mutual self-giving and co-operation. Love is thus the Sanctifier of our created selfhood. For in Christ the individual has ceased to be his own centre; he has surrendered his 'old man' to be recreated in the 'New Man', the New Organism which is not his old selfhood purified from self-seeking, but Christ (Gal. ii. 20; iii. 27–8; Eph. iv. 13). Now it is this New Whole which fills the entire horizon. While it is true that the Presence 'tabernacles' in the body of every Christian (1 Cor. vi. 19), it is true only because each Christian is a 'living stone' built up into the single Naos (1 Pet. ii. 5; Eph. ii. 20–2). First and always it is the Church as a concrete Whole, a Unity compacted out of multiplicity by the working of the Divine Love, which is 'the habitation of God in the Spirit' (Eph. ii. 22).

And now St. John shows us the inner glory of this mystery. The Presence is Love, because God Himself is Love; and because God is Love, the Presence is not simply an effluence which descends from the Godhead, it is God Himself. Whether therefore we speak of the Presence as Holy Spirit or *the* Holy Spirit is a matter of pure indifference, for the meaning is one and the same. That Indwelling Energy who in the One Body knits the many members into one is He who within Himself is the Eternal At-one-ness, Father with Son and Son with Father in ceaseless and perfect mutual self-giving and co-operation: He is Spirit, and Spirit is Love. This Revelation illuminates all Sacred History, and through it bears witness to God's dispensation for the entire universe. Of both of these we shall speak at greater length in the Epilogue, but a word may be said on the former, before we close this chapter.

The Revelation that God is Love illuminates all Sacred History. In the first place it justifies that central *theologumenon* of the Covenant which we have been studying all through this book. It shows us, that is to say, why the conception of the 'tabernacling' Presence was of such vital importance that it must be preserved against the strongest impulses of the human reason. It was not enough that Israel should learn to adore God with the mind alone. Other men of other nations could do this, and did do it, and have for centuries done it, not unworthily. But finite man can never be 'at one' with the Infinite on the plane of 'pure thought', and Israel was called that it might show men the more excellent way. That did not mean that it must not tread the other path first. On the contrary, until it had comprehended the transcendent Holiness of God, it was unfit to behold His greater Glory with an unveiled face: it must know Sin, and know it to its most abysmal depths, before it could approach with boldness to the throne of Love. Yet that throne must always be present to its conscicusness, and present not as an abstract ideal but in a form which foreshadowed the concrete Reality to come. Always before its eyes and under its hands Israel must have a presentment of the mystery of the Promise, that Jahweh would in very truth 'tabernacle' in Zion.

This was the first stage in Sacred History, and we know with what a 'fulness of the times' it ended. But how shall we describe and interpret the second stage? First, the Revelation of the 'tabernacling' Presence in the Church sets upon this, as upon its predecessor, the seal of the Covenant. The People and the Presence—these two are still inseparable in fact as in thought

though nineteen centuries have passed since Pentecost. What, then, of the Revelation that God is Love? If God 'so loved the world', what place can there be in His Counsels for a People chosen out of the world (John xv. 19)? And if He, who is Love, Himself 'tabernacles' in this People, where is that oneness of body, soul, and spirit by which it should manifest His Presence? These two questions cannot but haunt the mind of every Christian, when he closes his Bible and reflects upon the facts of history. How can these be reconciled with what he has just been reading? And yet what light can he follow, if he turns from the Eternal Light? Some answer to these doubts and questionings must surely be attempted, if those who profess and call themselves Christians are to be worthy of the name. For the faith which, despairing of this world, seeks to be wholly other-worldly loses its very soul, Love.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON INCARNATION AND INCORPORATION

The interpretation of John i. 14 proposed in the preceding chapter may be criticized on the ground that it makes the Incarnation begin at Pentecost rather than with our Lord's Conception and Nativity, the inference being that it cannot therefore be correct. This is a general question which could not be discussed within the scope of the chapter, and since it is an extremely important one, it has been reserved for a separate note.

We may remark first that the objection as stated in these terms makes an assumption which must not be allowed to pass unchallenged. That assumption is that the term 'Incarnation' has a precise Scriptural meaning; that, in short, it denotes in the New Testament a particular historical event

which took place at a particular time, i.e. with the taking of our flesh by the Son of God. But this assumption is unfounded. The Bible knows nothing of the words 'Incarnate' and 'Incarnation', from which it follows that there is no New Testament 'doctrine of the Incarnation' with which the proposed interpretation conflicts.

The objection may, however, be reworded. It may be said that if this interpretation is accepted, it makes a distinction between the Word's taking flesh and His being 'made flesh' (in a New Creation), a distinction which is not to be found elsewhere in the New Testament. The inference, as before, is that it cannot for this reason be correct. This is a charge which must be carefully examined.

(i) It must be replied in the first place that the meaning of a particular message must be determined primarily by the writer's own teaching elsewhere. Now it is perhaps the strongest point about this interpretation, not merely that the words so interpreted are congruous with the truths revealed in our Lord's discourses in the later chapters of the Gospel, but that *in their particular place* in the Prologue they provide precisely that summary of them which we might have been led to expect. This makes it extremely probable that the interpretation is correct; and if this is so, then, whether he agrees with the rest of the New Testament or not, St. John does make implicitly the distinction noted above.

(ii) But does this involve his being in conflict with the rest of the New Testament? To test this, let us take a passage which should be good and impartial evidence, because it is the Epistle appointed in the Prayer Book for Christmas Day; namely the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Here the contrast is drawn between the angels who are but 'ministering spirits' and Him who is the effulgence of God's glory and the very image of His substance, through whom He made the worlds. Him God has appointed heir of all things, who having made purification of sins sits now on His right hand, 'having become by so much better than the

angels as he hath inherited a more excellent name than they'. This 'name' is that of 'Son'; and, as the writer goes on to show, its 'excellence' has been acquired not by the taking of our flesh but by the sufferings endured in that flesh for our salvation; and its crown is the bringing of 'many sons unto glory' (Heb. ii. 10). 'Sonhood' in other words is an achievement wrought through our Lord's Death, Resurrection, and Ascension; and this chapter has therefore only a remote reference to Christmas Day.

[It may be noted in parenthesis that this fact would have been much clearer to Anglicans if our Church had preserved the ancient Use. In the Sarum, as in the modern Roman, Use there were three Masses appointed for Christmas. At the first the Epistle was Titus ii. 11–15 and the Gospel Luke ii. 1–14; at the second they were Titus iii. 4–7 and Luke ii. 15–20 respectively; only at the last Mass were our present Epistle and Gospel recited. The omission of these earlier more direct references to the Nativity has obscured the fact that Heb. i. 1–12 and John i. 1–14 are intended to remind us of the Redemptive *issue* of the Nativity rather than of the Nativity itself.]

To make matters quite clear, we may follow up the quotations from the Old Testament by which the writer of Hebrews supports his teaching; for these not merely reveal his own outlook but show how early Christians interpreted the Scriptures about Jesus.

The first quotation is from Ps. ii. 7: 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.' The interpretation of this (which obviously cannot apply to the Conception or Nativity, any more than to our Lord's Baptism) is expounded plainly by St. Luke in Acts xiii. 32–3. 'We bring you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers, how that God hath fulfilled the same unto our children in that he raised up Jesus, as also it is written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.' So in Acts iv. 25–6 other verses of this psalm are recited in praise of the Risen,

Ascended, and Glorified Christ. The heathen rage vainly against God's Anointed Servant Jesus; and those who know the psalm know why. It is because, sitting in heaven, He 'laughs them to scorn', for God has set Him as king upon His holy hill of (the heavenly) Zion and given Him the Gentiles for His inheritance (Ps. ii. 4, 6, 8). And all this is in virtue of the decree: 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee' (ii. 7).

The second quotation is from 2 Sam. vii. 14: 'I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son.' Here the new Sonhood is specially connected with the building of a 'house' for the Name. The writer of Hebrews does not interpret this Naomorphically (see Appendix); but whether this 'house' is regarded as the Naos inaugurated on the Cross or whether it is treated as meaning a household, as the writer appears to treat it (Heb. iii, 2–6), its 'building' by Jesus was accomplished by His faithfulness unto death (Heb. iii. 2). He became a Son over the house, i.e. He was able to build it, because He was first a faithful Apostle and High Priest (cf. Heb. v. 5–6, where the Sonhood of Ps. ii. 7 and the eternal Priesthood are expressly and immediately combined). It need hardly be said that if this passage is interpreted Naomorphically, as in the rest of the New Testament, the connexion of Sonhood with the Cross is thrown into even higher relief.

The third quotation is from Deut. xxxii. 43 (Gk.): 'And let all the Sons of God worship him.' This is part of the last verse of the Song of Moses, which is a thanksgiving for the Redemption of Israel by its Rock (1 Cor. x. 4; cf. Heb. ii. 13 = Ps. xviii. 2) and ends with the prediction that He will judge His people (xxxii. 36 = Heb. x. 30, where it is interpreted of the Last Judgement), and will avenge the blood of His servants and render vengeance to His adversaries (xxxii. 35, 41, 43). It is introduced by the writer with a reference (often overlooked) to the Second Coming: 'when He *again* bringeth the firstborn into the inhabited earth, He

saith'; and this shows that the worship of the angels is to be offered not to the Babe of Bethlehem but to Jesus, who because of the suffering of death has been crowned with glory and honour (Heb. ii. 9; cf. xii. 22–4) and returns in Judgement.

The fourth quotation (Heb. i. 8) is from Ps. xlv. 6. 7: 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever', &c. Once again the reference in the writer's mind is to the crowning of Jesus with an eternal kingship because He has 'loved righteousness and hated iniquity'.

The fifth quotation is from Ps. cii. 25–7: 'Thou Lord in the beginning', &c. Its relevance is not apparent till we have turned to the psalm itself. There we find the prediction of the Resurrection (13), the worship of the Gentiles (15), the building up of 'Zion' and the Lord's appearance in His Glory (16 Gk.), and the praises of a people that shall be created (18). The verses actually quoted then serve to emphasize the eternal nature of Him who looks down from heaven and looses those that are appointed to death (19–20), and reminds Christians that it is said of Him, 'The children of thy servants shall continue, and their seed shall be established before thee' (28). Those whom Jesus has made His brethren He has perfected by one offering for ever (Heb. ii. 10 f.; x. 14).

The sixth and last quotation is from Ps. cx. 1: 'Sit thou on my right hand', &c. This familiar reference to the Ascension needs no comment.

It is clear from these passages that the writer's doctrine of Sonhood not only echoes the traditional interpretation of the second Psalm but, so far as it goes, agrees substantially with the teaching of the Pauline Epistles. According to St. Paul, 'God sent forth his son born of a woman, born under the law, that he migh redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons' (Gal. iv. 4–5). This Sonhood into which we have been adopted and the Spirit of which (being the Spirit of the Son) we have

received, is the Sonhood manifested in Christ through His Death and rendered universal through His Resurrection: He who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh has been declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead (Rom. i. 3–4). By this last phrase, as we have seen, St. Paul indicates that the Resurrection of Christ is collective: it is the rising to a new life of all who are baptized into His Death and have been made joint-heirs with Him through the fellowship of His Sufferings. (Rom. vi. 3–4; viii. 15–17.) This is that Name ('the more excellent Name') which He who humbled Himself to be the Servant of God received at His exaltation, the Name *in* which (by participation) every knee shall bow to the Father (Phil. ii. 6–11). And the Sonhood, which this Name declares and of which the Spirit is the seal, is realized in the membership of the Body of Christ (1 Cor. xii. 12 f., &c.).

Now all this is precisely what St. John teaches in his own language, and, so far from being in conflict with the rest of the New Testament, the proposed interpretation of i. 14 serves to emphasize this agreement. If this is not at first clear, it is probably because our terminology is inadequate. If we desire to restrict the term 'Incarnation' to our Lord's Conception and Nativity, then we must confess that St. John with St. Paul and the writer of Hebrews has little to say about it. But then also we must find a new term for that which they do say a great deal about, namely that inheritance of Sonhood which we share with the exalted Christ in virtue of His Death and Passion. If we call this (as we may well do) 'Incorporation', then the matter becomes clearer. It is 'Incorporation' which is the climax of St. Paul's Gospel; and it is 'Incorporation' of which St. John is speaking when he says 'The Word was *made flesh* and tabernacled *in us*, and we beheld His Glory', and which is for him also the consummation of the Redemptive work of Christ. And this 'Incorporation' (like the Nativity) has its particular time,

its 'hour', its 'this day'—and its 'not yet': it begins on the Cross with the inauguration of the new Naos and manifests its fulness in the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost. Then, and not till then, Christ became incarnate in those who received Him, and they became 'inspirited' in Him by the Communion of His Flesh and Blood: And thenceforth even Christ 'after the Flesh' is to be known no more: there is a New Creation, which under whatever name fills the whole horizon to all eternity.

EPILOGUE

EPILOGUE

IN this book we have been studying the mystery of At-one-ment as it is revealed in the Holy Scriptures, but the doubts referred to at the end of the last chapter show how much more thinking has to be done on this subject. If Christians can find it possible to ignore or deny their own Election, to wonder whether the Church has failed, to ask whether it is God's will that there shall be a Church, one, visible, holy, and apostolic on earth, it must be evident that we have still far to go before we can apprehend the riches of the glory of our inheritance in Christ. In conclusion, then, let us examine very briefly two propositions which may help to set this problem in a new light.

1. *The New Creation is the crown and fulfilment of the whole creative process.* In St. Paul's words it is that mystery of the will of God whereby He chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world that we should be holy and without blemish before Him in love, according to His good pleasure which He purposed in Him unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth (Eph. i. 4, 9–10). At-one-ment, that is to say, is a mystery which God is working out in time and space, not merely in what we call history but through all the ages that are past, as well as all that are yet to come. First, Creation; then, after untold millennia, and through Election, New Creation: this is the Design of the universal Economy in the counsels of Him that 'worketh all in all'.

The New Creation is thus of one nature with the Old. To

use a scientific term, there is not merely an analogy but a real *homology*, an intimate creaturely relationship, between them. Our Lord's parables testify to this homology, which indeed gives them their unique significance. We can interpret the things of spirit in terms of life and matter, because all are manifestations of the working of the same Will. This point is of such importance and has hitherto been so little studied by Christians that some treatment of it, however brief and inadequate, is clearly desirable.

When we observe closely the system of created nature we find underlying it a principle of co-ordination and integration which builds it up through an ascending series of stages into an ordered structure of 'wholes'.[1] Now this principle, which Gen. J. C. Smuts has called 'Holism' (Gk. ὅλος = whole), is for Christians nothing else than the manifestation of Creative Spirit, who is Love. Step by step from the lowest level of Creation upwards, by divers portions and in divers manners, the transcendent yet immanent Presence has thus wrought order out of chaos, life from the lifeless, man from the animal. How He has done this is beyond our comprehension and will always remain so: but the marks of His workmanship, once we understand where to look for them, are too plain to be disguised. God, who is Eternal At-one-ness through mutual self-giving and co-operation, has built up this world by a progressive communication to it of His own Life, so that at every stage there has been an 'increase of the body in love'.

[1] J. C. Smuts, *Holism*, p. 109. A Whole is 'a specific structural synthesis of parts with inner activities of its own which co-operate and function in harmony . . . towards a definite inherent inner end or purpose' (ib.).

That this is no mere figure of speech is plain when we consider even the humblest organism. 'An organism', it has been said, 'is fundamentally a society in which innumerable members co-operate in mutual help in a spirit of the most effective disinterested service and loyalty to each other. Co-operation and mutual help are written large on the face of Nature. Nay more, if cell structure and function can teach us anything, they are imprinted deep on the nature of the universe, they are the very meaning and soul of Nature.'[1] No words could put the essence of the matter more clearly, but their immense significance seems hardly to have been grasped either by the author himself or by many of his Christian readers. They show us that the secret of Creation is nothing more nor less than progressive At-one-ment, wrought 'according to measure' by that Presence who is Holy Trinity.

Let us consider this process a little more closely, but still in the simplest terms.

'When the Amoeba [one of the most primitive animals] is dividing, the two halves are united by a bridge or waist, and for a time the organism is bi-cellular with two nuclei. But in higher Protozoa the bridge may not be broken, and if each of the new cells divide again we have an organism of four similar cells, and if these four divide we have organisms of eight and then of sixteen cells, and so on. Thus we arrive at a multi-cellular organism, which, if we regard each cell as an individual, forms a *colony*. Now there are three orders of colonies. The first consists of a collection of cells which have no intimate connexion with one another, whose protoplasms do not intermingle, and from which any cell can be separated without harming the colony: here each cell lives independently of the others. This is an example of a *Colony of the First*

[1] Smuts, op. cit., p. 85.

Order. In the cell-colonies of the *Second Order* we find collections of cells which at first are very much alike, but they cannot live independently of the other cells that make up the colony. . . . In colonies of the second order there is no differentiation of function. Each cell performs all the vital processes which are associated with life, though some cells may be set aside to form eggs and spermatazoa. But by far the greatest bulk of plants and animals consists of numbers of cells vitally related to one another, various functions being assigned to various sets of cells. Their tissues consist of a collection of cells each of which performs certain definite functions peculiar to that tissue. . . . These form a *Colony of the Third Order*.'[1]

All these forms of life exist side by side to-day, but if we accept the verdict of biologists it was by some such progressive stages that all the higher organisms have come into being. The process, in short, has been one of increasing *communalism*. There has been an ever closer knitting-together of the unit-cells or zooids, an ever more effective breaking-down of their 'individualism', a more and more pervasive commingling of their separate lives, till out of this fellowship something completely *new* has at last appeared. And let that word be boldly stressed. In the fulness of the times there has come into being a *new creation*; a new 'whole' which transcends and yet is immanent in all its members; a new miracle of creative alchemy whereby Many have been made One.

We can follow this process even farther. As the world of living organisms developed, it split up into two great lines of advance, which we call the Invertebrate and the Vertebrate respectively; the one leading to the highest forms of the Insect Kingdom, the other to Man. Now it

[1] Sir Arthur E. Shipley, *Life*, 1930, pp. 19–20.

is a remarkable fact that in the former of these we find an even more complex type of communalism; a social life, in fact, which can be described, after the terminology already used, as that of a Colony of the *Fourth* Order. In the insect-communities of the termites, bees, and ants we are faced with a phenomenon which is unique of its kind and of the highest interest and importance. What Maeterlinck has called the 'spirit' or 'genius' of the hive, or the 'occult power' which rules the termitary, is a mystery which no man can fathom; but its nature is none the less obvious. For if there was to be a higher grade of creative at-one-ment on the purely animal level, it must surely take this precise form. As the cell-units of the lower grades were combined to build up the more complex structure of the organism, so the individual organisms would naturally become in their turn 'cell-units', knit together to form a new organismal whole.[1] This does not, of course, in any way explain the mystery; but it classifies it, it puts it in its right place in the ordered system of the universe. We recognize that in their own realm these 'little-brain' animals have attained a new state of existence, have experienced the miracle of a new creation.[2]

All this becomes of vital significance when we turn to

[1] Cf. W. M. Wheeler, 'The Ant-Colony as an Organism', *Journ. Morph.* 1911, p. 307; M. Maeterlinck, *The Life of the White Ant*, 1928, pp. 143–4.

[2] Maeterlinck in tracing the 'stages of progressive civilisation' amongst the bees gives a summary of these stages which is curiously similar to Shipley's enumeration of colonies quoted above (*The Life of the Bee*, chapter i. 7). It is true that we cannot trace such stages in the history of the ants or the termites, but the same advance from solitariness to full communalism may have been achieved by these insects also. It is clear at any rate in the case of the bees that the hive-community is a new creation with a life and spirit which is more and other than that of the individual member.

Man and consider his continual efforts to achieve a communal life. These efforts, which in our own day have reached their highest pitch in Communism and Totalitarianism, are not only vain, but apart from Christ must always remain so. And the reason is not far to seek. The development of the 'big-brain' Vertebrate line, of which Man is the crown, brought with it an ever increasing measure of individuation with a progressive masterfulness of behaviour; till in the course of the ages true selfhood emerged, and with it true individualism. As Smuts has strikingly put it, 'Mind appears as a rebel in the universe, whose self-centredness and purposeful striving might and largely does make for disharmony and disorder rather than for peace, order and harmony. . . . Mind the rebel has appeared, Self the anarchist has emerged, and the ancient order of the Universe [the structure of Holism] is profoundly disturbed.'[1] At what point in its history this mystery of Sin entered the Cosmos cannot be determined; nor does this concern us. It is enough to know that it exists, that it exercises in each one of us a potent and baleful influence, and that it frustrates our best unaided efforts to achieve a real at-one-ment with one another.[2]

It is singularly unfortunate for this reason that many Christian writers are apt to compare the life of human societies with that of a true organism.[3] Nothing, in fact,

[1] Smuts, op. cit., p. 250.

[2] It is perhaps interesting to note that true communalism (such as that of the insects) is unknown among the Vertebrates. Even that most gregarious animal, the beaver, works for himself, inhabits his own lodge, and lives his own life more or less independent of others of the community (R. S. Lull, *Organic Evolution*, pp. 217–18).

[3] Von Hügel, *Essays and Addresses*, vol. i, pp. 257–8, vol. ii, pp. 113, 267; L. S. Thornton, *The Incarnate Lord*, p. 52. For a trenchant criticism of this view see J. Y. Simpson, *Man and the Attainment of Immortality*, pp. 214–15.

could be farther from the truth. Before Man can rise to this higher state of existence there must be a new creation, wrought not by himself but by that power which orders the world; there must be a new miracle of at-one-ment, which will deliver Man from the bondage of his selfhood and, while preserving his integrity, will subject all his energies to the service of a new Whole. And let it be noted that this conclusion, though it is actually realized in Christ, is based upon our previous survey of the cosmic process. It could be reached, that is to say, in the abstract by one who did not accept the Christian Revelation but, observing only the ordered march of Evolution, was content to follow it in thought to its natural fulfilment. Such a reasoner, conscious of the gulf which divides man's spiritual capacities from those of mere animals, would not commit the disastrous mistake which has been perpetrated by modern dictators. He would realize that for humanity there is no going back to the communalism of the hive and the ant-heap. But learning what these within their limits had to teach him, he would envisage an at-one-ment of the same mysterious nature, a welling-up within the hearts of men of a new spirit of self-subordinating fellowship, from which a new and truly organismal being would emerge.

So far a process of purely abstract reasoning can carry us; it is when we pass beyond this point that it becomes powerless. For where in concrete reality is this 'spirit of fellowship' to be found? Where shall we seek this 'genius', this 'occult power', which will integrate and co-ordinate the life of the new Whole? Human thought is incapable of answering these questions, and with good reason, because they concern the mystery of life itself.

This Whole, which we have been led to expect, is not to be a mere man-made readjustment of human relationships; it is to be a new creation, a lifting-up of men to a new state of existence by a new principle of being, which will at once transcend and be immanent in each one of them. All, in short, will be new; as it is written, 'Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man' (1 Cor. ii. 9). It is God, then, not man, who must give the answer, and when we turn back to the Christian Revelation, we can see how perfectly He has crowned His works.

As we have already noted, God has built up this world by the progressive communication to it of His own Life of At-one-ness, so that 'co-operation and mutual help' are 'the very meaning and soul of Nature': yet at the same time He has given His creatures an increasing measure of freedom, from the blind reactions of a simple awareness to the purposive striving of conscious, masterful selfhood. So step by step, foreseeing the price that He must pay, He has made Man; Man who, having this selfhood, asserts it against the law of his own being, yet who, possessing this freedom, can rise through it to the Being which is eternal. Now in the fulness of times a new creative act becomes possible—or, rather, *that* act becomes possible which was ordained from before the ages to be the consummation of Love. Hitherto the Presence, whose seal is the mystery of at-one-ment, has 'tabernacled' in His creatures after the mode of an impersonal energy; so that their functioning might seem (in human terms) largely 'mechanical'. Nor indeed could it be otherwise, since Love must work in silence till it can be greeted and adored. But with the creation of Man the silence can be broken. Now there are ears

planted which can receive, and minds organized which can assimilate, Truth; there are hearts to be fired with it, lips to proclaim its praises. Now therefore the Eternal Word, who made all things, manifests Himself not only in, but to, His Creation.

At the first He reveals Himself as a personal transcendent God, speaking through prophets to His Chosen People. Through the mouths of these interpreters He illuminates the darkness of history. Signs and wonders in heaven and earth and sea announce the Divine initiative. Victory and defeat are recognized alike as instruments of an unchanging Purpose. Above all, sorrow and suffering lose their tragic futility and begin to disclose the secret of the hidden Godhead. For as yet all has not been revealed. One mystery still remains, which not even the vision of the prophets can penetrate but to which they cling with a faith that cannot be shaken. Within the Cloud there is a Glory which confounds the reason; within the People there is a hope which abides when hope seems vain. The Presence and the People—in the conjunction of these two all the promise of the future resides, for through them is to come that ultimate universal At-one-ment when God is all in all. But now prophecy falls silent, for that which is to be accomplished cannot be wrought by words. Selfhood, the inmost citadel of the human heart, must be stormed and its kingdom yielded to Love. The Word has spoken: now in the stillness of God He becomes Man.[1]

Now it is that we can apprehend something at least of the mystery of the Incarnation. A new creative act is to be consummated, out of which a new being—a new Organism—will arise; but now, because its unit-

[1] Ign., *Ad. Eph.* xix. 1.

members will be personal selves, the principle of its integration must be personal also: the Creator Himself will 'tabernacle' within His own. Or we may put it otherwise. This creative act, like all those which have preceded it, is an act of at-one-ment wrought out of the Life of God who is Love: but now, because the unit-members of this Body are beings capable of love, the spirit of its fellowship will be the Holy Spirit of the Eternal At-one-ness. By this one act, therefore, God not only crowns His Creation but in crowning it raises it to Himself. He makes a new being and at the moment of that miracle gives it His own Eternity. God becomes Man that Man may become God.

2. *The Life of the New Creation is Eternal Sonhood.* This all-important truth follows naturally from what has just been said: yet in most of us individualism is so far yet from being converted into fellowship, that its meaning too often escapes us. We still think of At-one-ment as something which transpires between God and an infinite number of separate selves, forgetting that it is the corporate union of the *People* with the Presence. The New Creation, in other words, possesses its own new organismal life; and this fact demands much more careful study than it usually receives.

Once more we must remember that the New Creation does not stand alone in the universe: between it and all other created wholes there is a true homology, however different the levels on which they stand. It is pertinent, then, to remind ourselves that all other living wholes possess their own specific kind of 'life'; and this means not merely their continuing in existence, but that which gives them their significance, their role in the world-drama—in a word, their functioning as wholes after a

specific mode of behaviour. The saying of the Preacher that a living dog is better than a dead lion may be taken as illustrating this point, not in its comparison of life with death but in its comparison of 'dog-hood' with 'lion-hood'. This valuation of two different kinds of life is of course aesthetic, not biological, and Palestinian rather than English; but the contrast between what constitutes 'dog-hood', the functional behaviour of this animal, and 'lion-hood', the functional behaviour of that, remains quite clear. Biologically these two animals are on the same level of evolution; they are 'Colonies of the Third Order', wholes made up of innumerable cell-units which subserve in one fellowship the functional life of the organism: and this life—whether it is that of the one species or of the other—is the life of that specific organism, not of its several members. These units, in short, are 'not their own'; they have been raised to a state of existence, have been made participants of a life, which is essentially and completely new: and each one of them, if it could speak, would be constrained to confess its dependence. 'I live, yet no longer I' is in this sense written large in the face of animate Nature.[1]

It will perhaps be well to pause for a moment at this point and consider a possible objection. It may be urged that to compare the members of Christ with the cell-units of an organism is to relapse into a totalitarian ideology. This criticism has in fact been made by Christians whom the writer deeply respects, and it can-

[1] It should be noted that the same facts are true of the Insect 'Colonies of the Fourth Order'. These communal 'wholes' are animals having their own specific life to which the units are completely surrendered and which is theirs in virtue of their joint participation in it. We mark this fact by speaking of them as 'peoples', though that comes far short of the truth.

not therefore be dismissed lightly. Yet what in reality is the situation? Let it be granted that to recognize the Body of Christ as a true Organism involves quite logically the reducing His members to a state of servitude. And what then? Do we imagine that St. Paul is speaking idle words when he tells us that we have been 'bought with a price' (1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23) and that we are the *slaves* of Christ (1 Cor. vii. 22; Eph. vi. 6)? But if so, we must suppose that he is also speaking figuratively of that 'bondage to sin' from which we have been saved into the bondage of obedience to righteousness (Rom. vi. 6, 16). But St. Paul, as we know, is describing a concrete reality. The Body of Christ *is* a fellowship which demands the entire surrender of our individual selves, so that we own no will but that of Him who has called us. That 'I Live, yet no longer I' must be true of each several Christian; and it is only when he has accepted the yoke of Christ that he finds his servitude to be perfect freedom. There could in fact be no better proof of our failure to ponder this mystery than that devout followers of Jesus should shrink almost in horror from the thought of total subjection to their Head![1] Surely they forget Who it is that claims their submission, and by what right He claims it, and what He offers in return.

There is, then, no ground for refusing to follow out the homology which we have been studying. Rather, because this Organism is the Body of Christ and its fellowship the Communion of the Holy Spirit, we can

[1] It is not without interest that in the passages quoted above our English Version uses the word 'bond servant' to render the bald Greek 'slave'. Is it possible that our translators were themselves not innocent of this distaste?

go forward with complete faith in the issue. We follow the Light of the World, and He will not lead us back into the darkness. Let us repeat, then, that *the life of the New Creation is itself fundamentally new.* This cannot be too strongly emphasized or too firmly grasped. 'Regeneration' is not (as some persist in thinking) the mere establishment of more 'spiritual' relations between the individual and God: it is an entering upon a new plane of existence, to which, individuality having been done to death, the self is raised up by Christ. *Re-generation is Incorporation;* it is the miracle of being born as a member of the new Organism. Life, as the naturally born man has known it, has been lost. He has been crucified with Christ, buried with Him in Baptism. Henceforth he is not his own; he lives, yet it is Christ that liveth in him; so that whether he lives or whether he dies he is the Lord's (Rom. vi. 4; xiv. 8; Gal. ii. 20).

When we go on to define this new Life more exactly, we have to begin by clearing away one ambiguity. We are accustomed to speak of Christ as having created or founded a 'New Humanity'. What does this mean? At first sight it would seem to contradict all that has just been said; and if the emphasis is placed on the word 'Humanity', the phrase may become dangerously misleading. For this cannot be its meaning. The Life of the New Creation is not 'man-hood', as we understand that term: it is God-head 'tabernacling' in the Body of the Incarnate Word, and may fitly be described as Sonhood.

This statement obviously needs elaboration, especially since St. Paul speaks of Christians as 'putting on the new man' or growing up into a 'perfect man' (Col. iii. 10; Eph. iv. 13). But what does he mean by this language? In the first of these passages he is referring to the new

life of Christians which is 'hid with Christ in God' (Col. iii. 3). Since we have died with Him, we must complete this dying in our members which are upon the earth (Col. iii. 5); for we have stripped off the 'old man' and have put on the new, which is being 'renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him' (Col. iii. 10). And in this 'new man' there is no Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, slave, freeman, but Christ is all in all (Col. iii. 11).

The last part of this passage is obscure, but its meaning becomes clear when we compare it with what St. Paul had already written to the Galatians:

> For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. In him there is[1] neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor freeman, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one [being] in Christ Jesus. (Gal. iii. 26–8)

This passage, with its use of the same forcible expression 'put on', makes it evident that the 'new man' is Christ, regarded here not as Head but as the entire Organism into whom we are born again (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 12). And this is the meaning also of the words quoted above from Ephesians. When St. Paul speaks of Christians growing up 'into [a] perfect man', he does not at all mean (any more than he says) that they are to become perfect *men*. Their 'perfection' lies in 'one-ness', the communion of the 'faith and the knowledge of the Son of God'; and

[1] The English Version translates both here and in Colossians 'there cannot be', but the Greek should surely be read as a simple statement of fact. In Christ there are no distinctions such as those into which we were naturally born.

their approach to that 'one-ness' is measured by the 'stature of the fulness of Christ' (Eph. iv. 13). Here again, though Christ is the Head, from whom all the body is fitly framed and knit together, He is also the new Whole, whose 'fulness' is to be filled up by those whom He chooses to be His members (Eph. i. 23). If then we are to call the Life of this Body a 'New Humanity', we must so understand it as to place all the emphasis on the word 'New'. For 'in Christ' not merely racial, cultural and social differences are abolished but the most fundamental distinction in human nature, the distinction of sex. There is a 'New Man' in the sense that there is a new created being whose Life is incarnate: but it still remains to define the proper nature of this being.

The New Man is Christ, *the Son of God*. As we have already seen,[1] this latter title has a dual meaning. It may refer to the Sonhood which belonged to the Word from all eternity; or it may refer to that Sonhood which He won, not for Himself but for us, through His Cross and Passion; and of which it is said, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee'. It is of this latter Sonhood that St. Paul is speaking when he says that we who have put on Christ have all become sons of God in Him (Gal. iii. 26–8). We have been baptized into His Body and been made to drink of His Spirit; and this Spirit is the Spirit of Sonhood whereby we say, 'Abba, Father' (1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iv. 5; Rom. viii. 15). So St. John in his Prologue says that we who have been born of God have been given by the Incarnate Word this power to become His children (John i. 12–13). So the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews begins with the

[1] See above, 'Additional Note on Incarnation and Incorporation', p. 245.

Sonhood won by Jesus through the suffering of death, through which He brought many sons to glory. But we need not multiply quotations about the fact itself: what concerns us here is much more what it implies. For these two Sonhoods cannot ultimately be distinguished. What the Word was before His Incarnation, that He secured as an inheritance for all who should believe in His Name. He became the Son of Man in order that, as the New Man, He might be 'declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the Resurrection of the dead' (Rom. i. 4). In that power He created a Body, in which all the fulness of the Godhead 'tabernacles' (Col. ii. 9); the fulness, for it is that Life of Spirit which is the Life of the Only-begotten in the bosom of the Father. What that Life is more particularly, we have now to consider.

We have to think first of the Life of the Son Himself, since it is His own Life which He imparts 'bodily' to His members. It reveals itself under two aspects, an inward and an outward:

(*a*) In its inward aspect ('*The Word was towards God*' —'*The only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father*'), this Sonhood denotes a relationship which is at once a state of being and an activity of function. It is thus Life after the manner of both the senses in which we understand this word. Because the Word is the Only-begotten of the Father, His Life is the Eternal Being of Godhead: because He is the Word, it is Eternal Response to the Father's Will. And these two are one. Since God is Holy Trinity, the Principle of whose Being is Eternal At-one-ness in perfect mutual self-giving, the Response of the Son—His functional Life—is itself an essential part of the Life of Godhead.

(*b*) In its outward aspect ('*All things were made through Him, and apart from Him was not one thing made*'—'*Apart from me ye can do nothing*'), the Sonhood of the Word is the working of At-one-ment: the Son is '*The Christ*'. So far we have had no occasion to dwell upon this title, since in spite of its increasing prominence in post-exilic Judaism it plays no part in the theology of the Old Testament.[1] Now, however, the Figure which the Jews dimly perceived comes suddenly into focus. 'The Christ' is not the 'Son of David' but the 'Lord' (Mark xii. 36, &c.); not the apocalyptic 'Son of Man' but the Suffering Servant (Mark viii. 31, &c.). And again these two are one. The Christ is the Son, who is manifested out of the invisible Godhead in the creative process of At-one-ment. He is the Cosmic Whole, the Fountain of all form and order in the universe: He is the Creative Presence, in whom are all things and He in them: and, as He is the Beginning and the continuing Presence so also He is the end; the 'Fulness' which is to be made perfect through the reconciliation of all things to God in Love (Col. i. 15–17; Eph. i. 10).

Now love in this highest sense is not a matter of instinct, it is an act of surrender made by a free and conscious Self. Love therefore only becomes possible for the first time on the level of human nature, though, when man has attained it, its influence can be communicated through him to the rest of creation (Rom. viii. 19 ff.). But man because of his self-centred individualism is incapable of attaining it: therefore the Son, as the Christ, Himself becomes man. He, whose Creative Presence in nature integrates and co-ordinates the members of all living wholes after the manner which

[1] Phythian-Adams, *The Fulness of Israel*, p. 191.

some call 'mechanical', imparts to free conscious selves, capable of love, the Presence of Godhead in its fulness. The Son, as the Christ, 'goes forth' from the Father to draw all men (primarily) into Himself: then having knit them together through Love in the Whole which is His glorified Body, He presents them to the Father, as the first-fruits of the At-one-ment, in the inmost Life of Holy Trinity.

We are now in a position to understand what 'Son-hood' means when it is spoken of as the nature and Life of the New Creation. Here, too, it has its inward and outward aspects:

(*a*) On its inward side it is participation in the inward Life of the Son, that is in the Eternal Life of His Response to the Father. But the response made by the New Creation is not the Son's own immediate direct Response; it is the response, mediated through Him, which His many members make together through their at-one-ment with one another in His Body. It is, in other words, *a response which is only possible in and through the Fellowship of the Spirit.* Herein lies the significance of the New Commandment, the Law of the New Nature. The Spirit of the Body is the Love who passes eternally from the Father to the Son and from the Son to the Father; and it is He who quickens the members in the manifold diversity of their 'gifts' or functions. But while it is thus God that worketh in them, building them up into the Naos which is the fulness of Christ, they too must work out their own salvation with fear and trembling. That is why St. Paul so often and so passionately pleads for oneness of heart and mind; a oneness only to be achieved by those exercises of Love which counteract the divisiveness of individualism,

namely humility, altruism, forbearance, longsuffering, tender-heartedness, forgivingness (Phil. ii. 1–5; Eph. iv. 1–3, 25–32; Col. iii. 12–14). That again is why St. John insists so repeatedly upon the New Commandment. God is Love; Love therefore is the supreme concrete Reality. But God is beyond the reach of the human senses: man therefore can only know and love Him through that Flesh—that concrete reality of manhood—through which He has manifested His Love in us by the Son. Love is not a 'spiritual' emotion; it is an intensely objective and practical exercise of the whole personality; and while God's gift to us of His own Spirit is our assurance that He truly abides in us and we in Him, we on our part must love one another in this Indwelling Glory, that we may be one, even as He is one (1 John ii. 3–11; iii. 10–11, 13–24; iv. 7–21; John xiii. 34–5; xiv. 21–4; xv. 7–10, 17; xvii. 19–23).

The Sonhood of the New Creation is thus different from, in that it is entirely dependent upon, that of its Head. While His own Sonhood is an immediate Relationship of Person and Essence, that of His Body is communal and conditional. The Christian is a son of God not in virtue of his possessing an 'immortal soul' but because he has been made a member of the Communion of Saints, which is the habitation of God in the Spirit. He is a son of God by 'Grace'; and Grace, because it is Love, frees him from his individualism and places him in the 'School of Charity'.[1] But Grace, just because it is Love, cannot force him to conform to its working. The Christian himself has to learn—as a New Commandment which is yet the oldest of all—that Love is the principle not only of his own but of all

[1] The title of Miss E. Underhill's very valuable little book.

being, and that he must practise it or perish. Dr. Nygren in his great study of *Agapé* and *Eros* seems to overlook this point. There is a Law of the New Covenant just as there was a Law of the Old; and it is impossible that it should be overridden by Grace. The Life of Sonhood is not a gift imparted to purely passive souls: it is a discipline of practical love which demands an unceasing devotion; a vigour (so to say) of weakness, which Grace can then make strong.

It follows from this that while the Sonhood of the New Creation is a present possession, received by inheritance from Christ, it can attain its perfect fulness only by the mutual self-giving and co-operation of all the saints. Manifestly at this point the mystery of At-one-ment enters in part into that which is within the Veil; and we can only assume, as a proposition which cannot be proved but which for faith needs no proving, that for those who are thus 'with Christ' the joy of Communion is all-absorbing and complete. But the New Creation is initially of this world; and the truth about its inner life will never be understood if this fact is forgotten or evaded. The New Creation is first and foremost a Whole composed of psycho-physical organisms, and planted in (and to that extent conditioned by) a psycho-physical environment: and it is as such and under such conditions that it has to make increase 'unto the building up of itself in love'. Here it is that those Christians seem to be so gravely mistaken who hold that Grace is a purely invisible and spiritual influence. Grace is Love given to build up love; it is the Eternal At-one-ness drawing men into oneness with one another that they may be at-one in and with Him. And since this oneness is for them not of spirit only but

of spirit and soul and body 'entire' (1 Thess. v. 23), an indispensable part of Grace is outward and visible. This is not a case to be argued, it is a matter of Revelation. It is open to the Christian—indeed it is his duty—to protest against the abuse of any particular ministerial office or of any other means of Grace: what is not open to him is to declare that neither a ministry nor sacraments are necessary for the full Christian Life.[1] The Naos of God is Flesh—risen and glorified but still Flesh: it is a Body which has received its own proper structure from the Head, an organismal Whole supplied and knit together from Him by joints and bands: and it is within, and by means of, this structure that the members can alone achieve and live their Sonhood (Eph. iv. 16; Col. ii. 19).

(*b*) On its outward side, the New Creation with its well-defined outward structure is an historical entity which the World can recognize, and which has to deal with the World. It is the Church, the *Ecclesia*, the Chosen People, the New Israel; above all it is that which gives all these names their true meaning, it is the Body of *the Christ*. After what has been already said, this last title needs little stressing. As the Master, so the servant; as the Head, so His Body; as the Captain of salvation, so His brethren. The response of the Church is something more than the perfecting of its own inner Life, it is a 'going forth' in the Name and strength of the Son to co-operate with God in the creative work of At-one-ment (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 9 ff.).[2]

We have now to face the practical issue to which the whole of this discussion has been leading. How is the

[1] This statement is not made as a criticism but as the assertion of a Scriptural truth which it is hoped all Christians will one day understand and practise.

[2] See above, p. 233 f.

Church to perform this task? How is it to make this response which will draw all men into the Communion of the Son and will present them through and in Him a living sacrifice, acceptable to God? The first and most obvious answer to this question is the preaching of the Gospel, a task which must weigh heavily on the conscience of Christians while there are still millions of our fellow men in whose midst the Word has never been sown. When we make this answer, however, we have to bear two considerations in mind. In the first place the Church must preach the *full* Gospel, the Gospel of At-one-ment, as we have attempted to outline it in the preceding pages. To preach Christ Crucified only up to the point at which the individual surrenders himself to the Saviour is not the 'whole counsel of God', because it fails to manifest Eternal Life. The Gospel which the Church preaches must be the Gospel of which the Church itself is an integral part; the Gospel which proclaims the joy of the conversion of selfhood from individualism into the glorious membership of the Body of Christ (Acts xx. 27–32).

In the second place we have to realize that the preaching of the Gospel can never win *by itself* a more than limited success. The reason for this is not really obscure; and we shall find, when we have examined it, that instead of depressing us it serves to make clear the greater task which lies beyond. The crucial point here is that very mystery of Election, which so many Christians seem either to ignore or to deny, but which is in truth one of the central themes of Revelation. We may take as an illustration of it a single well-known passage, John vi. 60–71. ('*This is a hard saying.*' . . . '*No man can come unto me, except it be given unto him of the Father*' . . .

'*Would ye also go away?*' . . . '*Did I not choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil?*') The combination in these few verses of what appears to be complete free-will with what appears to be absolute pre-determination presents a contradiction which is insoluble by the human reason. One fact, however, stands out prominently, namely that the Gospel in its fulness is a 'hard saying' which few men can receive: and we are reminded that elsewhere it is said to be part of the 'mystery of Godliness' that He who was 'preached among the nations' was actually 'believed on in the world' (1 Tim. iii. 16)![1] We cannot explain this, for it lies deep in the 'foolishness of God': but we can at least recognize the chief mental obstacle which for many honest and thoughtful men stands in the way of faith and seems to suggest that they remain, at least for the time, outside the Election. Generally speaking, they reject the Christian Revelation, not because they have deliberately hardened their heart to it but because it seems to them irrational, and its dogmas make no contact with the only world of reality with which they are familiar. Now this state of affairs can never be wholly remedied by preaching, no matter what efforts we make to present our message in terms of modern knowledge. A purely rationalist Modernism, in particular, is here worse than useless. Rationalism of this kind simply denies mystery; and to deny it is to destroy the foundations on which the Faith is built. We find ourselves once again in a world where the highest values are ethical, and the Life in Christ becomes a kind of sublimated philanthropy.

[1] Father R. M. Benson noted this remarkable statement in one of his letters, but it seems usually to have escaped attention.

To abandon the ministry of preaching, on the other hand, because of this 'hardness' is of course unthinkable; for God has 'much people' in every city who will have ears to hear, and He adds to them continually (Acts ii. 47; xviii. 10). But unless we assume that He is content to leave the rest of His creatures to their fate, we must acknowledge frankly the limitations of the spoken word, and seek out a more excellent way.

To-day there is no doubt at all what that way must be. What the 'World' needs is not only to hear about Love but to meet it in the concrete reality of human experience. What it needs is not only the Word of Life as preached but the Word made Flesh, which men can see with their eyes and handle with their hands. If they can find *that* in their midst, a Living Body which fulfils in objective actuality all their deepest aspirations, men will not reject it because it makes apparently incredible statements about its origin and nature, they will come to its light and take hold of its skirt, saying, 'We will go with you' (Zech. viii. 23). And, when we think of it, there is in the last resort no other way than this. The Church cannot commend the mystery of the Gospel unless it is in fact that mystery which it preaches. If it goes forth proclaiming the supreme truth of Love, it must do it 'not in word neither with the tongue; but in deed and truth' (1 John iii. 18). If it is to bear witness to the At-one-ment through the Blood of the Incarnate Word, it must be that which it celebrates and on which it feeds, the Communion of His Flesh and Blood.[1]

[1] 'If you are the body of Christ and His members, it is the mystery of yourselves that is laid upon the altar. It is the mystery of yourselves that you receive. It is to what you are that you say Amen.' St. Augustine, *Serm.* 272.

Our survey is now ended, and it remains to ask what inferences can be drawn from the considerations which have been briefly outlined above. First and foremost they offer a solid reassurance to all who are tempted to wonder whether the Church has failed. In these pages we have tried to see the Church not only as it has been designed from Eternity but as it has been, and is still being, built up in time: and under either aspect the answer is the same. The Church has not failed and cannot fail, because it is the Body of Christ the Conqueror, and lives in Him the Life of His Eternal Sonhood. Only those indeed who entirely misconceive its nature can entertain for a moment the idea that it has suffered defeat. But what then of the weakness and the divisions of Christians? If the Church's function is to manifest At-one-ment to the world, how can we deny that it has miserably betrayed its trust? The answer—and we must claim boldly that it is an answer, not an evasion—lies in the immense significance of the time-process for the New as for the Old Creation. It is of the essence of Christianity that it is an historical religion; and that not merely in the sense that God has entered history at a particular point as Man but much more that from the foundation of the world He has been working out His Purpose in successive stages. When we consider the Church from this point of view, when we see it as the climax of an agelong process of At-one-ment, we realize at the same time that as an Organism it is still in the making, and that the long-suffering of God still waits upon its maturity.

It may be said that to assert this is to be guilty of presumption, since it is not given to us to know times

and seasons which the Father has set within His own authority (Acts i. 7): what right have we to speculate about the future, when at any moment the end of all time may be decreed? To this it may be replied that, while we must never slacken our vigilance, there is another duty for which we shall be held responsible when that Day comes: it lies with us to interpret the times by the knowledge which has been committed to us, using out of our treasury things both new and old (Luke xii. 56; Matt. xiii. 52). And the simple truth is that when we do this, the history of the Church assumes a new significance. We have been accustomed to think of it as an institution venerable almost to the point of decay: we learn now to see it as a living creature whose birth took place almost in recent times. Such is the scale of human existence and development as we know it to-day. Hundreds of thousands of years have run their course since man first started on his long upward path: and when we measure the slowness of his spiritual growth against the stature of the fulness of Christ, the nineteen centuries which have passed since the Church was born seem hardly more than a few years of bewildered adolescence. So much in that short span has had to be endured; so much to be learned—and unlearned! So many perils have had to be faced, both from without and from within! Such wars of conquest, patriotism, religion; such wrestlings and upheavals of nations and empires; such ardours and insurrections of spirit; such prodigies of invention; such miracles of scientific discovery! Against this torrent of the ever changing, ever adventuring, ever masterful energies of man the gentle stirrings of At-one-ment might well seem powerless: and we who against hope can discern to-day the surge

of those Living Waters should abase ourselves in awe and wonder before the Grace of God.

Slowly, yet with an unfaltering power and persistence, the Holy Spirit is leading the Church on to its perfection. All the signs of our times proclaim this: it is one of the great certainties of life. From one end of the earth to the other the wind of At-one-ment breathes ever more strongly. Divisions once proudly acclaimed have lost their glamour. Doctrines once held as the only sure tokens of Election have fallen from their high estate. And this has come about not because men love their own church less fervently or believe less firmly the truths which their forebears championed: it is because everywhere, by divers portions and in divers manners, they are being brought to a deeper knowledge of the Perfect Man. Now, in truth, it is high time to awake out of sleep. Now Christians have learned that divisions merely stultify the ministry of the Gospel; and they are learning too that doctrines and religious practices which they once condemned may after all be gifts entrusted by the One Spirit to stewards not less faithful than themselves. So gradually there is taking shape the vision of an Oecumenical Church, a Church in which old 'unhappy divisions' shall become blessed diversities of grace abounding. So in loyalty to the one Lord the growth of the one Body makes increase, and in love of the brethren the promise dawns of a closer fellowship in the new Whole.

Here then is the opportunity of our time: and it is for us to redeem it, working out our salvation with fear and trembling. By God's grace we are 'running well': let no man and no thing hinder us from obeying the truth. How much remains to be done, we are all conscious of;

but what concerns us is our immediate duty. And that duty is surely clear. It is to go back to the fountain-head of Holy Scripture and learn from it how to realize and make manifest to the nations the riches of the glory of our inheritance in the saints. Let it be repeated that this is the duty of all of us: for, whether we know it or not, there has been a veil over our hearts when we have read the New Covenant; a veil which will be lifted if we return to it with a strong desire. Then we shall understand what sacrifices are demanded of each of us and we shall offer them willingly, counting them loss for Christ: for we shall see Him in His fulness, the Head who makes perfect His Body; the Presence who fills His House with glory and gives it His peace.

In that day, surely, whatever is self-centred in our religious beliefs; whatever asserts itself against the unifying breath of the Presence; whatever, being by nature subordinate to the central truth, has through man's blindness been permitted to usurp its primacy; whatever breeds fear instead of love, and fosters pride and hatred and factiousness—all this will be diligently sought out and purged for ever away. So it will be, for example, with the Sacred Ministry. Christians will understand that no order, no office, in the Church can be called valid or regular save one which performs the function for which it was appointed, the building up of the Body in Love. So, on the one hand, if episcopacy survives (as Anglicans cannot doubt that it will), it will be because it fulfils this one necessary condition, not on the ground of its traditional origin: for it will be realized that in the living Body that which was once vital *may* outlive its usefulness and become an obstruction, not a channel, for the flow of Love. And so, on the other

hand, it will be remembered that it is Christ, not any one or any group of His members, who ordains the helps and governments which are to perfect His saints: and no office however recent, which He seems to have blessed and fructified, will lightly be 'made common'.

So again it will be with the Sacraments. It will no longer be felt tolerable to think of Baptism as the door through which the individual seeks refuge from a perishing world. This negative self-regarding aspect of Redemption—so prevalent still to-day and so disastrously misleading—will be swallowed up completely in the positive self-abandoning thought of Election; of the Call through a New Birth into the New Life of Christ's Sonhood, where all are servants together of the Servant of God. Need it be said how this thought, deeply and consciously held by *all* Christians, will bring them, as one man, to the great Sacrament of the At-one-ment? Here through the outward and visible realities of Bread and Wine they will receive that Food of Eternal Life which binds them together as living stones into the Naos of the Living God. And here, with the Response of the Head, the priestly Body will offer its own Response of Eucharist; its sacrifice of Love which is one with His and yet its own; its Wholeness which is His Wholeness and yet its own, its Fulness which is the Fulness of Him that filleth all in all. In the joy of this supreme act of Sonhood there will be no more place for tragic misunderstandings and rash presumptions. Here where the People and the Presence celebrate the mystery of a bridal union, 'mortal flesh' will in truth 'keep silence'.

This vision may be yet for many days, but it is good for us to return to it from time to time and to realize

that it is not simply visionary. Let us only remember, in conclusion, that it is not the final goal of the Christian's endeavour, and that we may hasten it best by looking beyond it to that other vision which fills the far horizon. For the Naos of God (let us say here for the last time what can never be said too often) exists not for itself but for the world: it is the meeting-place of Love where all creatures must find Him at the last. The day which we hope and work and pray for is the day when the Church will be manifested among men no longer as the Tabernacle of the Presence which moves in the midst of them, but as the City of God, the Zion which will be their home:

AND I SAW NO NAOS THEREIN FOR THE LORD GOD THE ALMIGHTY
AND THE LAMB ARE THE NAOS THEREOF.
AND THE CITY HATH NO NEED OF THE SUN NEITHER OF THE MOON
TO SHINE UPON IT.
FOR THE GLORY OF GOD DID LIGHTEN IT
AND THE LAMP THEREOF IS THE LAMB.
AND THE NATIONS SHALL WALK AMIDST THE LIGHT THEREOF
AND THE KINGS OF THE EARTH DO BRING THEIR GLORY INTO IT.

APPENDIX

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

THE 'Epistle to the Hebrews' has many points of contact with Naomorphism, but when we examine it more closely we find that the writer has followed a line of thought which is entirely his own. As this has contributed largely to our neglect of the mystery of the Presence, it is pertinent to add a few words on the subject.

The 'Epistle' as it stands remains a problem for scholars, and it may therefore be legitimate to record a purely personal impression about it. This is that in substance (to the end of chapter xii) it is a sermon, which has been adapted by its author to serve the purpose of a letter; a sermon preached *at* the Eucharist (cf. Justin, *Apol.* I. lxvii. 3 ff.) and preached *about* the Eucharist. This hypothesis, which cannot be discussed here at length, provides the clue without which the course of the writer's argument is difficult to follow. A sermon implies a text (which is precisely what we need before the abrupt opening of the present 'epistle'); and this text seems to have been a version of the Words of Institution which in the Blessing of the Cup followed the Matthaean tradition:

> 'Take eat; this is my body. . . . This is my blood of the Covenant which is shed for many unto the remission of sins.' (Matt. xxvi. 26–8)

In these words there is latent the whole contrasted picture which the writer proceeds to draw between the Old and the New Covenant. The Old was 'ordained through angels': the New is given by a Son. The Old was mediated by Moses, who was faithful as a servant: the New by the Son, who is set over the house of God which he has made (the reference is to 2 Sam. vii. 14, but the 'house' is not the Naos but the 'household'). The Old required a succession of mortal High Priests to offer sacrifices for sins: the New is

instituted by a High Priest who offered Himself once for all and lives for ever. The Old had 'ordinances of divine service' and a tabernacle 'of this world', made with hands after the pattern showed upon the mount: the New has the true tabernacle, 'heaven itself', in which we draw nigh to God. The Old sought to expiate sins by the blood of sprinkling: the New was consecrated by the blood which 'speaketh better than that of Abel' and which opens 'the new and living way' to the throne of Grace. The Old was inaugurated at the mount that 'burned with fire': the New leads us unto the city of the living God 'with angels and archangels and all the company of heaven'.

This picture has been so skilfully and so eloquently drawn and is moreover so familiar that its defects are not immediately obvious. Yet they are there, and they have to be faced. It must be noted first that the writer lacks the inspired historical sense of St. Paul. St. Paul himself regarded the ordinances of the Old Covenant as shadows of things to come (Col. ii. 17), but he held fast to the mystery of the Presence who 'tabernacles' on earth amidst His People. That is why he never speaks of the Mosaic tabernacle but always of the Naos whose perfection Ezekiel foretold: and that is why he can interpret Lev. xxvi. 12 of our Incorporation in Christ. But the writer of the 'Epistle' seems to know nothing of *this* fulfilment. For him there are only two things, the copy-shadow tabernacle of Moses and the real and perfect tabernacle which is 'heaven itself' (ix. 11, 24), not the Body of Christ.

So again with all his emphasis on our redemption from sin St. Paul does not forget that sin is no more than an obstruction which must be done away in order that the Naos may be made perfect; in other words, that its members may be able to offer a perfect eucharist, a 'living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God' (Rom. xii. 1). This, as we have seen, is the true historical fulfilment of the Temple ordinances, in which the rites of expiation were designed to re-

open the way to the primary eucharistic sacrifice. But the writer of the 'Epistle' has no room in his scheme for this consummation. For him the only sacrifice worth mentioning is the sacrifice offered for sins: and Christ is our High Priest not in the sense that He leads the eucharistic worship of His Body (both in heaven and on earth) but in that He offered Himself for sins once for all in a sacrifice which has 'perfected for ever them that are sanctified', and now 'ever liveth to make intercession for them' (vii. 25; x. 10, 14).

But this is not all. In his anxiety (as we may conjecture) to give the fullest possible interpretation of the words of his text, the writer has been led to make a singular slip. The Words of Institution speak of 'My Blood *of the Covenant*', with obvious reference to the rite described in Exod. xxiv. 8. But the writer, with his mind wholly engrossed with the idea of the 'remission of sins', extends this sprinkling of blood to the tabernacle and all its furniture (ix. 15–21). In so doing he misses a point of the greatest importance, for it is assumed in Exodus (xl. 9 f.) that these do not need 'expiation' but are to be *consecrated* with *oil*, not with blood. In other words, when the Covenant has been ratified with blood 'once for all', the People receives a special sanctification, which enables it henceforth to offer continually its acceptable sacrifice of eucharist. Here once more St. Paul follows (implicitly) the true interpretation of the 'shadow'. The consecration of the tabernacle with oil is fulfilled in the consecration of the Naos with the Holy Spirit: this it is which sanctifies the People so that it may stand before God holy and 'without blemish' (sacrificially perfect) and become His habitation; not as perfected once for all in an instant, but as growing up towards the fulness of Perfect Man.

It was to be expected after this that the writer's doctrine of the Holy Spirit would in other respects show signs of incompleteness; and we find this to be true. There are actually only five passages in which the Holy Spirit is explicitly mentioned. In three of these the reference is to the inspira-

tion of the Scriptures (iii. 7; ix. 8; x. 15); in one of them to gifts and 'distributions' which are ranked with 'signs and wonders and manifold powers' (ii. 4); and in the fourth to the 'enlightenment' of Christians who have 'tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come' (vi. 4). It may be inferred that the writer is thinking of the Holy Spirit not as the Indwelling Presence in the Church but as a supernatural power which confers 'inspirational' *charismata* of the kind named in 1 Cor. xii. 4–11, i.e. wisdom, knowledge (the writer's 'enlightenment'), gifts of healing, workings of powers, prophecy, and tongues.

All these may seem in themselves comparatively minor points of difference, but they prepare us for a conclusion which is far from trivial. The real truth is that in the 'Epistle to the Hebrews' the dualistic tension of Covenant theology has disappeared, and as a result 'heavenly' religion has become paramount. This means—since 'heavenly' religion is natural, rational religion—that for all his insistence on the Incarnation the writer has sought to rationalize the mystery. Through the veil which is the flesh of Jesus we can 'draw nigh' to God, but God does not dwell in us, working in us that At-one-ment which is at once Holiness and Love. Rather we appear before Him as those who have already been perfected by the sacrifice of Christ; and if hereafter we are guilty of one act of wilful disobedience, we shall suffer the vengeance of the consuming fire. This terrible conclusion, from which the Church has always recoiled, is the inevitable result of missing the beaten track of Sacred History. It is terrible, in fact, because it is logical and rational: and logic and reason cannot penetrate the true mystery of the Incarnation. At the heart of that mystery, itself the answer to the mystery of Sin, lies the paradox which defies all our efforts at solution, that we can work out our own salvation with fear and trembling because it is God that worketh in us, and God is Love.

It follows—and this is the chief weakness of the 'Epistle'—

that the appeal to Christians remains a purely self-centred one. Under the combined spur of fear, hope, and faith the Christian is encouraged to 'flee for refuge' to 'that which is within the veil', i.e. in 'heaven'. 'Love of the brethren' must of course continue (xiii. 1), but his primary preoccupation is with his own security, and his first duty is to 'hold fast' (iii. 6, 14; iv. 11; vi. 18; x. 23) and obey the New Covenant (ii. 1–3; iii. 12–19; vi. 4–6; x. 26–31). That Sin is not mere wilful disobedience but an abysmal perversion of selfhood; that the New Covenant is not simply a restatement of the Old on a 'Christian' but still purely rational level; that there is a New Creation whose Spirit is the Eternal Love and whose Fellowship is one in which salvation means utter self-abandonment—of all this the writer shows no awareness. His Gospel is in truth a Gospel of 'Enlightenment' (vi. 4; x. 32), not of At-one-ment; and this, to whatever heights it may carry us, fails to fathom those depths where our need of succour is most desperate.

To put it in a word, the Christianity of the 'Epistle to the Hebrews' is that type of religion which looks wholly 'upwards'. It is essentially ethical, not Spiritual (in the Pauline sense); individualistic, not Incorporative. In fact it is that stern, often luridly apocalyptic, gospel of the Puritans, which in a much reduced form is held by most Protestants to this day but is now everywhere so rapidly losing its grip. We may call it, to use a cumbrous term, 'transcendent monotheism'; and it is this to which people really refer when they speak of the decay of religion. They are quite right; for transcendent monotheism, of whatever variety, has had its day. Like the writer of the 'Epistle', it has fallen a victim to its own ineluctable logic and has ceased to be tolerable or credible even in its Christian guise.

But the Revelation of God in Christ remains quite unaffected by this overthrow of old religious conceptions. It forces us rather to turn to it afresh and reassert those aspects of it which we have overlooked or forgotten. For the Gospel

of Christ is not, and never has been, a religion of transcendent monotheism, it is the revelation of transcendent-immanent Trinity in Unity: and though we may not at first understand all that this distinction implies, we can at least see that it has changed for us the meaning of 'God'. How much more than this it has to tell us, what hope it inspires, what riches of glory it reveals, we shall learn through the Spirit who enlightens the eyes of our hearts; but we shall learn it, humanly speaking, as students of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, not of that gifted and eloquent Christian who composed the 'Epistle to the Hebrews'.

INDEX

Abiathar, 33, 61, 86.
Abraham, 155, 161.
Age, the New, 91–4, 97–100, 103–6, 174–6, 182, 184 ff.
Aijalon, 28.
Altar of Incense, 110.
Amos, 48–9, 64, 98.
Anathoth, 61, 68.
Angel of the Covenant, the, 37, 57, 180; in Ex. xxiii, 54–5; in Ex. xxxiii, 56; in Isa. lxiii, 56; in Mal. iii, 56, 58, 131–2; in St. Mark, 131–3, 144; in St. Stephen's speech, 156, 157.
Ark, the, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 23, 37, 59, 241; in Song of Deborah, 22–3; restored by David, 23, 33, 47; focus of the Presence, 14 f., 20, 42; staves of, 15 f.; mobility of, 16, 23, 47; lost to Northern Kingdom, 43; in the Holy of Holies, 45–6, 48; dimensions, 45; relation to the Cloud, 47–8; Jeremiah's attitude to, 67 f.
Ascension, the, 76.
Asher, 35.
Aton, Hymns to, 18.
At-one-ment, the, 6, 7; prophesied by Ezekiel, 91–5; Priestly legislation for, 107 ff.; realized in Christ, 149; not preached by St. Peter in Acts, 150–1; taught by St. Paul, 185–202, 254; its dual nature, 197; its consummation, 201, 262, 273; taught by St. John, 232–6, 238–41; the Church's mission, 240, 275; first-fruits of, 271, 278; Gospel of, 275–7, 291; progress of, 280.

Baalim, 44.
Baptism, Holy, 266, 268, 282; in St. Paul, 128, 183, 184, 185, 190; in St. John, 227, 231–2.
Beersheba, 28.
Bethel, 28.
Beth-horon, 37.
Bethlehem, 29.
Beth-shemesh, 69.
Bible, the, documents of, 37; text of, 42; the vehicle of Revelation, 87–8; inspiration of, 102; study of, 281.
Blessings and Curses, Ceremony of, 32 f., 34.
Body of Christ, the, *see* Church.
Burnt-offering, 25, 26, 30.

Calves, the Golden, 43, 55.
Central Sanctuary, the, 21, 23, 26, 27, 29, 31–6, 43–4.
Cherubim, the, 46, 51, 82, 84.
Christ, the, 140, 141, 270, 274.
Christological controversy, the, 38 f.
Church, the (*see also* Naos, New Creation, *and* New Israel), the Body and Naos of Christ, 185, 187–8, 196–204, 241, 272–3, 277, 280; a true organism, 6 f., 200–1, 243, 259–60, 262–6, 273; priesthood of, 204, 240–1, 282; unity of, 243; its life of Sonhood, 268 ff.; its age, 279; its mission, 233 f., 274–7.
Cloud, the, *see* Pillar *and* Presence.
Communalism, 256–8, 260.
Communism, 259.
Cornelius, 145.
Covenant-Code, the, 23, 26–9, 34, 54.
Creation, the, 254–61, 263.
Creed, 38.

David, 21, 25, 29, 156; proposes to build Temple, 15, 53; restores Ark, 23, 33, 47; seed of, 146, 158–63, 187.
Day of Atonement, the, 113–14, 117.
Deborah, Song of, 22, 26, 35 f.
Deuteronomic editors, 26, 43, 54.

Deuteronomy, 27, 33, 56 f.; code of, 28, 30, 32.
Deutero-Isaiah, 133–6, 183, 192.
Diaspora, the, 154.
Driver, S. R., 55.
Dualism of Covenant-theology, the, 39, 40 ff., 55–8, 59, 60, 66, 88, 103, 119, 179–80, 290.

Ebal, 31, 32, 33.
Edification, 197, 199, 203.
Election, 2 f, 6, 26, 189, 245, 275–6.
Eli, 31, 33, 61.
Elkanah, 27, 29.
Ephraim, Mount, 23, 31, 35; tribe of, 30 f., 32.
Eucharist, the, 152, 204, 282.
Excision, 106–7, 113.
Expiatory rites, 25, 93–4, 108 f., 113 f., 288–9.
Ezekiel, relation of to Jeremiah, 71–3; his organization of worship, 72, 93; book of, 77 ff.; his acted parables, 78, 80; trance-visions, 79–81; mission, 80–1, 90, 92; teaching, 81–2; visions of the Presence, 82, 87; prophecy of New Covenant, 84, 91–2, 148–9, 185–6, 189, 192; naomorphism, 88–90, 144; vision of dry bones, 94; of New Naos, 94–5, 219, 224; his influence, 96, 99–100; his expiatory rites, 110 f.

Father, the, 149, 197, 269, 271; in St. Paul, 180, 185, 187; in St. John, 236–41.
Feast of Tabernacles (Ingathering), the, 29, 98–9, 217.

Gerizim, 31–3, 164, 218 f.
Germany, 41.
Glory, the (*see also* Presence), 138–9, 155, 167, 176, 181, 197.
Gospels, the, 123–8.
Grace, 272–4.
Guilt-offering, 25, 93, 109, 113–14, 116.

Haggai, 97, 219.
Harford, Battersby, 77–8.
'Heaven', 37, 40, 43, 49, 75–6; in Targums, 179; in St. Paul, 189; in Hebrews, 288, 290–1.
Hebrews, Epistle to the, 6, 108, 117–18, 124, 224, 246–50, 287–92.
Hieron, the, 44, 61–2, 73–4, 94, 101–2, 109, 140, 152–3, 163.
Hinduism, 41.
Holiness (*see also* Purification *and* Sanctification), 103 ff., 114 f., 190 ff.
Holism, 201, 255 f.
Holy Communion, the, 234–5, 239, 251, 282.
Holy of Holies, the (*see also* Oracle), 15, 24, 45; expiation of, 109 ff.; workmen in, 113; voiding of, 143, 224.
Holy Place, the (*see also* Naos *and* Sanctuary), 45, 47, 113, 109–11.
Holy Spirit, the, 2, 7, 146, 149–51; charismata of, 150–1, 290; New Age of, 184 ff.; the Indwelling Presence, 164–5, 187–90, 196, 201, 233, 235, 243, 263, 271, 280, 289–90; confers Sonhood, 187–9, 190, 250, 268; Fellowship of, 197, 220, 242–3, 271, 291; Glory of, 214, 224.
Holy Trinity, the, 6, 188, 224, 233, 239–40, 243, 255–6, 261, 263, 269, 271–3, 292.
Horeb, 12, 20, 22, 32, 37, 47, 70, 109, 139.
Hosea, 49; his prophecy of the Resurrection (v. 15–vi. 3), 125–8, 167, 183, 216; of the New Israel, 171.

Incarnation, the, 214, 226, 245–6, 250, 262, 290.
Incorporation, the, 88–9, 214, 250, 266, 288.
Individualism, 92, 198–9, 243, 263, 266, 270, 271, 272, 282.
Inspiration, 90, 102.

Isaiah, 51, 82, 217, 230; prophecies of Redemption, 170–2.

Jahweh, conception of in early Israel, 18–19, 37 f., 42; loyalty of Israel to, 26; leads Israel from Horeb, 20, 22; 'tabernacles', 19, 21, 32, 36, 42, 48, 51, 55, 62, 115; 'walks', 13, 15 f., 21, 23, 83, 116, 159; God of Hosts, 26, 32, 46, 51, 52; Lord of the Land, 26, 37, 63 f., 68, 81, 99, 103; blood offered to, 29; dwells in heaven, 37, 49 f., 56 f., 60, 75–6, 115; World-ruler, 49; Holiness of, 51, 55, 57; the Purifier, 70–3, 93; the Shepherd, 94; the Father, 115, 118, 144; pours forth His Spirit, 94.
Jahweh-altars, 28–9, 32.
Jashar, Book of, 11.
Jeconiah, 71, 73.
Jehoiada, 48.
Jehoiakim, 62.
Jehoshaphat, 48.
Jeremiah, 59 ff.; his belief in the Presence, 60–2, 70; use of Deuteronomy, 62; of the Name, 62–3, 70; prophecies of restoration, 64 f., 68 f., 96–7; his mission, 65, 73; attitude to sacrifice, 65 f.; to the Ark, 67 ff.; prophecy of the New Covenant, 70 f., 92; relation to Ezekiel, 71–3.
Jericho, 21, 34.
Jeroboam I, 43, 55.
Jerusalem (*see also* Zion), 74, 99–100, 218, 219–20.
Jesus Christ, the God-Man, 38–9; the Servant, 127, 133 ff., 147, 149, 183, 248; the Presence, 127, 130, 141, 166, 197; the 'Lord' of Malachi, 132, 137–9, 181, 223; the Word, 135–6, 139, 178, 212, 223, 230–9; builder of the Naos, 141–4, 160–3, 200, 202–3, 216, 222–5; the Seed of David, 146, 147, 161–3, 187; the 'prophet' of Moses, 147; the Prince of Life, 147; the Image of God, 178, 189, 196, 238; the Head of the Body, 185, 198, 202–3, 265, 268, 272, 281; His consciousness of Godhead, 123, 128–9; His Sonhood, 129–30, 143, 187–8, 228, 236–9, 240–50, 268–71; His Baptism, 137; His Transfiguration, 138–9; His Death, 183–5, 188–90, 223, 232–4; His Resurrection, 125–8, 146, 167, 183, 198, 216; His Ascension, 146; His Exaltation, 187–8, 198, 224; His Glory, 197, 231; His Name, 146, 148; the Bread of Heaven, 232–3; the Vine, 234–5; the Son of Man, 137, 231–2, 269; the New Man, 243.
Joel, 98, 146, 149, 183.
Jordan, 35, 37.
Joshua, 35.
Josiah, 62.
Judah, 44, 48, 49.
Judges, Book of, 26, 35.
'Justification', *see* Purification.

Kidron, 99.

Land of Jahweh, the, 21, 26, 27, 32, 37, 74, 81, 99, 103; in Jeremiah, 63 f., 68; in Ezekiel, 85–6.
Levites, the, 28.
Living Waters, the, 94, 98–100, 149, 151, 217, 224.
Love, 196–7, 201–2, 203, 224 n. 1, 227 f., 234–5, 238–40, 242–5, 261, 263, 270–3, 277.

Maeterlinck, M., 258.
Malachi, 131–2, 140, 144, 230.
Manoah, 37.
Mercy Seat, the, 45–6, 109–10, 185.
Merneptah, 35.
Micah, 49–50.
Middōth (Tractate), 112.
Midrash, the, 177.

Mishnah, the, 113 f.
Modernism, 276.
Monotheism, 40, 119, 291–2.
Moses, 12, 19, 32, 109, 156, 157, 161, 167, 178, 287–8.
Mount of Olives, the, 84, 140.

Naaman, 21.
Nadab and Abihu, 110.
Name, the (*see also* Presence), 16, 28, 36, 38, 49, 52–8, 62–4, 143, 158, 161, 187; Angel of, 180.
Naomorphism, definition of, 88; in Ezekiel, 88–9; in St. Mark, 141–3; in St. Stephen's thought, 160 f.; in St. Paul, 173–4, 185, 187–8, 196–7, 202–4; in St. John, 215–26; not in Hebrews, 287–8.
Naos, the Old (*see also* Sanctuary), meaning of, 44, 73; built by Solomon, 45; in Micah, 50; in Isaiah, 51; shield of Israel, 69; abandoned by the Presence, 83–5; rebuilding of, 96 ff.; expiation of, 109 f.; upper chamber of, 112–13; annulled on the Cross, 143, 223–4.
—, the New (*see also* Church, New Creation *and* New Israel), Ezekiel's visions of, 88–9, 94–5; Living Waters from, 94, 98, 149, 151; in St. Mark, 140–4, 195; in St. Paul, 173–4, 185, 187–8, 192, 196–7, 199, 200, 202–4; in St. John, 216, 222–5, 240; the perfection of At-one-ment, 149; raised on the third day, 141–2, 151, 160, 223–5; unity of, 198; consummation of, 283.
Naphtali, 35.
Nathan, prophecy of (2 Sam. vii. 1–17), 15, 53–4, 158–63, 187, 248, 287.
Navel of the Earth, the, 99, 218.
New Commandment, the, 233, 271–3.
New Covenant, the, 69 f., 84, 143, 175, 244, 281, 287–8.
New Creation, the (*see also* Church, Naos, *and* New Israel), 175, 178, 184, 194, 201, 226, 246, 251, 254–5, 261, 263, 266, 271–8, 291.
New Humanity, the, 232, 235, 266–9.
New Israel, the (*see also* Church, Naos, *and* New Creation), 3, 125–8, 171, 198, 234–5, 274.
Nicodemus, 208, 227, 231.
Noah, 30.
Nob, 31, 32.
Northern Kingdom, the, 43, 49, 68 f., 81.
Nygren, A., 274.

Old Covenant, the, 37–9, 40 ff., 64, 287–8.
Old Israel, the, 3–4, 12, 16; early conception of Jahweh, 18–19, 37 f.; loyalty of, 26, 36; settlement of, 34–5, 42; faith of, 38–9, 42; restoration prophesied, 64.
Oracle, the (*see also* Holy of Holies), 15, 45, 48, 55, 57, 69, 101.

Pantheism, 41.
Passover, the, 29.
Peace-offering, 25, 27, 30.
Peake, A. S., 63.
Pelatiah, 80.
Pentateuch, the, 37.
Pentecost, 145, 146, 214, 224.
People, the (*see also* Old *and* New Israel), At-one-ment with God, 92–3, 263, 282.
Philip, 164.
Philistines, the, 32, 34, 47.
Pilgrimages, 23, 29, 34.
Pillar of Cloud and Fire, the (*see also* Cloud *and* Presence), 12, 14, 105.
Polycrates, 209.
Preaching, Ministry of, 275–7.
Presence-bread, 33, 45.

Presence, the, 3, 4, 6, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22–3, 25, 27, 55, 59; significance of, 12 f., 90; sanctuary of, 21; associated with the Ark, 14, 20, 42, 57; with the Cloud, 14, 47–8, 57, 139, 176; with the Stones, 47; with the Glory, 48, 62, 83, 88, 101, 107, 109, 112, 116, 138, 221, 224; with the Angel, 54–5, 56, 131–3; with the Name, 56 f.; with the Shekinah, 112, 138 n. 1, 176–7, 180, 221; with Wisdom, 134; with the Word, 135–6; in Amos, 49; in Jeremiah, 60–2, 70; in Ezekiel, 82–7; reduced belief in, 73 f., 96; post-exilic faith in, 96 ff.; worship centred on, 28, 102–3, 107, 222; not in Second Temple, 112 f., 224–5; fulfilled in Christ, 130–3, 141–4, 151, 163, 165, 167, 173–4, 176, 181, 184–9, 191–2, 196, 201, 203, 220, 224, 232–6, 243–4, 262–3, 281–3.
Priestly Code, the, 113.
Priestly Writers, the, 66, 93, 103, 105 ff., 191.
Priests, the, 28, 133–4, 164.
Purification, of Israel, the, prophesied by Jeremiah, 70–2, 104 f.; by Ezekiel, 72, 91 f., 93, 104 f.; as preparation for At-one-ment, 91, 104 f., 185, 189–90; not experienced before Christ, 113.

Rabbinical Teaching, 114–15.
Ramah, 28, 29.
Ras Shamra, 40.
'Reconciliation', *see* Purification.
Redemption (*see also* Purification), in Deutero-Isaiah, 133; in St. Mark, 137; in St. Paul, 198.
Remission of sins, in Mishnah, 114.
Repentance, 114 f.
Revealed Religion, 76, 87–8.

Sacramental Religion, 107–8, 273–4.
Sacred History, 1, 38–9, 55 f., 57 f., 59, 103, 224, 242–5, 262, 278, 290.
Sacred Ministry, the, 274, 281.
Sacrifice, 25–7, 30; prophetic attitude to, 65–6; restoration after Exile, 96 f.; fulfilment of, 152, 176, 186, 190–2, 194, 201, 204.
St. John, 142, 198; identity of, 205–11; his relation to St. Paul, 211–13, 216, 242; his Prologue, 213–15, 227, 246; on the 'tabernacling' of the Word, 215–26; on Love, 224 n. 1, 227 f., 234–5, 238–43; on the New Birth, 227, 231–2, 235; on the Word, 212, 230–9.
St. John the Baptist, in St. Mark, 132, 137; in St. John, 213–14, 225, 227, 229.
St. Mark, Gospel of, 131–4, 136–44, 146.
St. Paul, 90, 153, 155, 169 ff.; his conversion, 165–8, 180–1; on the Resurrection, 127–8, 183, 188, 194–5; on the New Naos, 173–4, 185, 187–8, 192, 196–7, 199–200, 202–4, 288; his attitude to O.T., 174–81, 288; his Gospel, 181 ff.; sacrificial language, 190, 194; on holiness, 191 ff.; on Sin, 193, 195–6, 198; on Sanctification, 194–202, 289; on the Church, 195; on the Holy Spirit, 196, 199; on Love, 196–7, 201–2; his relation to St. John, 211–13, 216, 242; contrasted with Hebrews, 288–9.
St. Peter, 138, 139, 145–52, 166, 206–7.
St. Stephen, 153–66.
Salvation, 2 f.
Samaritans, the, 31, 164–5, 218–19.
Samuel, 28, 29, 47.
Sanctification (*see also* At-one-ment), in Ezekiel, 91–2; in St. Paul, 185–202; meaning of, 243, 289.

Sanctuary, the (*see also* Naos), 16, 45, 70, 83; as the place of Jahweh's feet, 76, 89; polluted by Israel, 80; annulled on the Cross, 143.
Saul, 28, 30, 33.
Seraphim, 51, 82.
Shechem, 28, 30.
Shekinah, the, *see* Presence.
Shiloh, 15, 27, 32, 61 f.
Siloam, 99.
Sin, 193, 195–6, 198, 259, 261, 262, 288, 290–1.
Sin-offering, 25, 93, 109, 110, 113–14, 116.
Smuts, J. C., 255–6, 259.
Solomon, his dedication-formula, 11, 17, 37, 42, 61; his prayer, 42 f.; his guilt, 43; the 'seed' of David, 53–4, 156; denounced by St. Stephen, 156 f.
Sonhood, 7, 129–30, 246–50, 266, 268–77; in 2 Sam. vii. 14, 129 f., 187; in St. Mark, 143; in St. Paul, 187–8; in St. John, 228, 236–9.
Spirit (Godhead), 187–8, 212, 219–20, 243.
'Spiritual' Religion, 44, 59 f., 66, 96; not taught by Jeremiah, 72–3; nor St. Paul, 191; nor St. John, 219–20.
Synagogue worship, 102.

Tabernacle, the, 110, 156, 161, 288–9.
'Tabernacling', 12 f., 15, 16, 17 f., 20, 42 f., 57.
Tables of Stone, the, 47.
Talmud, the, 112, 177.
Targums, the, 112, 176–9.
Temple, the, 31, 44 f., 50, 59; dedicated by Solomon, 11, 17 f.; the Ark installed in, 15; law-book of, 33; the house of the Name, 54; profanation of, 62; effect of its destruction, 73, 96; focus of post-exilic worship, 115; used by Christians, 152; denounced by St. Stephen, 156ff.
Ten Words, the, 47.
Tent of Jahweh, the, 15.
Totalitarianism, 259, 264.
Tradition, 36–9.
Transfiguration, the, 138–9.

Valley of Hinnom, 64.
Valley of Jehoshaphat, 49.
Veil, the, 45, 101, 110, 143, 197, 224.
Voice, the, 82, 83, 85, 167, 181.

Welch, A. C., 65–7.
Wisdom (*see also* Presence), 134–5, 177, 180.
Wisdom, Book of, 178.
Word, the, 135–6, 139, 180, 262, 277; in the Targums (*Memra*), 177; in St. Paul, 178; in St. John, 212, 230–9.
Worship, in early Israel, 25 ff.; eucharistic note of, 25–6, 242; Jahweh-altars for, 28–9; at Festivals, 29; post-exilic, 116–18; in St. Paul, 190–2; in St. John, 219–20, 222, 239, 240; Ideal of, 275, 277, 282, 288.

Zadokites, 33, 86.
Zebulon, 35.
Zechariah, 97, 219.
Zion (*see also* Jerusalem), in Amos, 49; in Isaiah, 51; in Jeremiah, 68; extension of Jahweh's Holiness to, 74, 100; its fulfilment, 283.

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
JOHN JOHNSON
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY

BS
619
.G5P5

1414604

Phythian-Adams
The people and the presence.

JUN 22 1945
MAR 8 1945
MAR 15 1945
APR 3 5 1945
JUN 1 1947
MAY 11 1950
DEC 3 1949
JUN 29 1951
MAR 20 1951
NOV 15 1952
SEP 20 1955
APR 23 1956
MAY 6 1957
MAY 21 1957
JUN 1957

JUN 14 1945
JUN 13 1947
RENEWED
RENEWED
RENEWED

1414604

NOV 17 19[illegible] O. G. Otterness
DEC 2 1958 22 Snell
DEC 2 1958
FEB 5 1959 R A EDWARDS
960 E. 55TH
FEB 3 1959
Jan 12 '60 R D Henderson
Feb 11 '60 1170 E. 61ST
[illegible] 2 days
Mar 21 '60 CT 336
Jan 20 6 Dr. J. Mengele
Jan 27 '61 4/5 6 Dakin
Mar 13 '62 Walter E. Root
Mar 29 '62 205 Valparaiso
Valparaiso, Ind.
MAY 8 1963 M. P. John
MAY 3 & 1963
Q.
JAN 27 1965 Wesley H. Wilkes
7326 Lexington

BS619
.G5P5

1414604

SWIFT HALL LIBRARY